BV
633
.H8

2nd Copy DELIVERED TO THE
FEB 21 1898
Library of Congress.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.
BV633
Chap. ..... Copyright No. .....
Shelf H8
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

A NATIONAL CHURCH

By the Same Author:

The Church Idea: *An Essay towards Unity.*

The Peace of the Church.

THE BEDELL LECTURES FOR 1897

A NATIONAL CHURCH

BY

WILLIAM REED HUNTINGTON

RECTOR OF GRACE CHURCH, NEW YORK

E Pluribus Unum

New York
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1898

TWO COPIES RECEIVED

BV 633
.H8

2096

Copyright, 1897,
By the Trustees of Kenyon College,
Gambier, O.

All rights reserved.

The Library
of Congress
W[illegible]NGTON

University Press:
John Wilson and Son, Cambridge, U.S.A.

TO THE

PRESIDENT AND FACULTY

OF

KENYON COLLEGE

WHAT WAS FIRST SPOKEN IN THEIR HOSPITABLE HEARING

IS NOW GRATEFULLY INSCRIBED.

CONTENTS.

I.

PAGE

THE THEORY 3

II.

PRACTICABILITY 39

APPENDIX.

A. CONCERNING NEUTRALIZATION OF TERRITORY IN THE REGION OF SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY 77

B. THE PLACE OF TEMPERAMENT IN RELIGION . 92

C. A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF IRENIC LITERATURE, AMERICAN AND ENGLISH 100

I.

THE THEORY.

A NATIONAL CHURCH.

I.

THE THEORY.

The philosophy of national Churches deserves an ampler discussion than it has ever yet received. Books in plenty, and very able ones, have been written upon the doctrine of the Church as a whole. Special "Establishments" of religion, such as the Episcopal Church of England and the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, have also polemic and irenic literatures of their own. But for the national Church pure and simple, the national Church considered as an entity, existing within and yet in a sense apart from the Church universal, while at the same time wholly independent of the civil State, — for this we seem still to lack any lucid or self-consistent theory. In fact, a dispassionate inquirer might well be pardoned were he to raise the question, Is such an organism as a national Church expedient, even if possible?

What account did Jesus Christ take of "nations," in the ordering of his kingdom, that we should presume to parcel out his world-wide realm in accord-

ance with the shifting moats and alterable hedges of the treaty-makers?

The local Church we know, the single pastor with his flock about him; the Church Catholic we know, "the blessed company of all faithful people": but what is this intermediary concept of a national Church? What is it better than a mere geographical expression, a name for something that has no substantive existence, a ghost of Gallicanism, an ecclesiastical No-man's Land? These are questions which the convinced Congregationalist and the convinced Ultramontanist agree in asking. Unless they can be met and answered, the advocates of national Churches may as well learn to hold their peace; they are on seas where navigation is dangerous, and neither the pilot of the barque of Peter nor the helmsman of the Mayflower will care a straw for their signals. On every account, therefore, it behooves us to be clear in our own minds as to what we are purposing to consider, and, however disinclined we may feel to the formality of definitions, not to attempt to discuss national Churches until we shall first have come to at least an approximative understanding as to what "nations" are. Perhaps some such statement as the following will serve us, at least for working purposes: *A nation is a people organized under one civil polity, established upon a definite territory, and possessed of sovereign powers.*

We need not deny that to the perfection of national life characteristics other than these which

I have named do greatly contribute. As respects the fulness and symmetry of their national life, some peoples are more blessed than others. It is much to be desired, for example, that a nation should be "of one language and of one speech;" but were we to make this requirement a part of our definition, we should rule out of the family of nations some of its oldest and strongest members. It is much to be desired, also, that a nation should be of one blood, one racial stock; but if we were to insist upon this point, we should kill the claim of the United States to nationality. No, the three all-important notes of nationality are those that stand out sharply in our definition, — polity, territory, sovereignty; there must be discipline, there must be area, there must be independence. How passionately the model nation of the former age clung to all three of these possessions every reader of the Old Testament remembers. Their law, their land, their freedom, — these, for the Hebrews of the monarchy, made the very essence of national life. At the wall of wailing in the modern city of Jerusalem, you may to-day see men and women lamenting with strong crying and tears the loss of these credentials of nationality. When Christ came, the Jews had already forfeited one of the three essentials, the sovereignty; but they still kept hold of the other two, their law and their land. They tried hard to persuade themselves that they were still a nation, but really they were no longer such. Their cry, "We have a law," availed

them nothing, so long as it must needs be supplemented by that other cry, "We have no king but Cæsar." Sovereignty having been lost, neither law nor land, nor both together, could make a nation of them. Since then, law, land, and sovereignty all have gone; they are a people still, but they are not a nation any more. Whether "Zionism" will make them such remains to be seen.

When the pioneers of Christianity began their enterprise, they found themselves, to all intents and purposes, face to face with but a single nation, the Roman. It was a nation conspicuously lacking in those non-essential notes of unity of which I was just speaking, oneness of language and oneness of blood; but, all the same, it met the requirements of our definition, in that it covered a recognized area, the basin of the Mediterranean, was under a single, even though variously adapted discipline, and possessed a sovereignty not derivative but original.

The sacred society, the *ecclesia*, which grew up under these conditions, was necessarily national in its scope, — not national, as we know, in the sense of receiving any formal recognition at the hands of the nation's rulers, for, on the contrary, it was officially persecuted; but national in the sense that it permeated the nation and took possession of it from within, as the sap of a tree mounts through the trunk until it has infiltrated limb and bough and twig and leaf. The Churches founded by St. Paul and his companions in different regions of the

Roman Empire were not national Churches at all, nor is there any evidence that they regarded themselves as such; there was but one nation, the Empire; and the conversion of the Empire brought into existence, by necessary process, the first of national Churches, the Roman, — not yet the Papal, be it observed, but assuredly the Roman. And this came about, let us never suffer ourselves to forget, by growth rather than by manufacture. It was a true genesis, not a forced contrivance. The Emperor Constantine did not make the Church national by establishing it, he established it because he found that by an unobserved process it had already become national. It would have continued national even if he had not established it, for everywhere throughout that whole Roman world it stood rooted at the centres of life.

We come, just at this point, upon one of the most striking of the characteristics that difference Christianity from Mohammedanism, the Church from the Mosque. Islam could carve out caliphates by the sword, irrespective of existing civil lines, for the plain reason that the sword was Islam's recognized and acknowledged instrument. But Christ's word to the Church is, "Put up thy sword into his sheath." The cross is not merely the symbol and token of Christianity, it is the implement as well; the conquests of the Gospel are conquests of love; and hence it follows that instead of creating territorial jurisdictions, as Islam, at whatever cost of

blood, is eager to do, the Christian Church simply accepts the jurisdictions which she finds made ready to her hand, only too thankful to let political geography alone, that she may bend all her energies to her proper task of blessing human life. The Church is militant, indeed, but her militancy is of the spirit, and her sword "bathed in heaven." She is content to let the powers that be district the earth as they will, and fix the metes and bounds at their discretion, if only upon the territory thus delimited she be allowed to enter, and to scatter over the ready furrows the good seed of the kingdom.

So far as the things justly and properly denominated things of Cæsar were concerned, primitive Christianity simply followed the line of least resistance; and as a consequence the first national Church found itself as perfectly fitted to the national administrative scheme as water, when the gate is lifted, fits itself to the arterial system of a modern city.

The bearing of all this upon the rise and growth of the Papal power it would be superfluous to trace. The story has been often told. Happily it is no longer necessary for one to prove his loyalty to Reformation principles by vilifying the Pope. The argument which Romanists base upon the Petrine texts in the Gospels is not so wholly devoid of plausibility that we must needs take for fools or knaves those who have accepted it as sound. It is a startling thought, but it is difficult for an observant

investigator of the past not to think it,— that it may have pleased Almighty God to make some use of the principle of illusion in his education of the race. The illusion that the Empire was the world, and that its chief ecclesiastic must necessarily be accepted as the world's spiritual head, may possibly have had a use and a value in its time of which we moderns are but ill-provisioned critics. Be that as it may, the point I am making holds good, that the early Church, both before its establishment by imperial edict, and after its establishment (so long as the frontiers of the Empire were unbroken), was a national Church, not ecumenical at all, or, if ecumenical, ecumenical only in the sense in which Rome meant the world, and the world meant Rome.

When the final break-up of the Empire came to pass, what had been the nation became the nations; and as each of these gradually sphered itself into a oneness of its own, the Christianity of each naturally took on, or, to speak more accurately, revealed a distinctive coloring. A converted people is as sure to retain a fractional part of its inborn characteristics, its constitutional habit, as a converted person is. To drive out nature with a club is as impossible in the case of races as in the case of individuals. A Celtic tribe, converted, and a German tribe, converted, did not cease to retain each its Celtic or its German traits. This is not in contravention of the truth that God has made of one blood all peoples, but simply goes to show that the one blood is subject to

some law of differentiation not dissimilar to that which endues with varying shades of green the leaves of one and the same tree. At any rate, the religious mind of the northern nations finally waked up to the fact that it had grown out of sympathy with the Christianity of the South, and, as a result, the Churches of the Reformation came into being, each of them national to such extent as circumstances permitted, but no one of them possessed of so strong a principle of internal coherence as the imperial body from which it had shaken itself loose. Meanwhile the old national Church, still centred, as before, at Rome, bated no jot of her masterful claim ; and in addition to the schismatical tendencies that disturbed them from within, the Churches of the Reformation had also to face the constant pressure of proselytizing approaches from without. Under these circumstances the philosophy of national Churches found breathing a little difficult; and only in a country blessed, like England, with splendid isolation, was such an intellectual achievement as the immortal "Polity" of Richard Hooker possible.

Simultaneously with the Reformation movement, came the discovery and tentative colonization of the two Americas, with the consequent struggle of the creeds to gain possession. South America fell to the lot of the still vigorous survivor of the old national Church of Rome, while North America, after many struggles, came to be recognized as the fair field without favor, within whose limits the

problem of the non-Roman national Church might conceivably, in some distant future, be worked out.

And thus, after our rapid glance at a far-spreading past, we find that we have reached to-day, — to-day with all its agitating anxieties and dreads; to-day with all its invigorating promise, its invincibility of hope. But our having reached to-day in our inquiry by no means releases us from the necessity of philosophizing; on the contrary, that duty lies all the more heavily upon us. Under the conditions of life in the United States of America, the difficult questions of national churchmanship lend themselves to discussion with better promise of fruitful results than anywhere else in Christendom. They mount the great telescopes nowadays in regions where the atmosphere is known to be exceptionally clear; doubtless we Americans have many motes in our sunbeam, but of the particular variety of mote known as ecclesiastial prejudice the air has, by many rains, been washed clean. Unhampered by establishmentarian prejudices, and without the slightest fear that the civil power will either lay an embargo upon our inquiry or flout us for the conclusions reached, we can work away at our problem with a perfectly free hand. There will be time enough for dealing with the practical side of the subject by and by. For the present the rationale, the theory, the why and wherefore of the matter, must still detain us.

For example, there is a concession to be made,

and a most important one. We are bound, I think, to concede to the Ultramontanist that his conception of the Kingdom of Christ as being world-wide in its scope and range is, as a conception, far loftier, far more soul-inspiring, than what is apparently the Nationalist's notion of the thing. The Nationalist can of course appeal and does appeal to the strong instincts of patriotism. The enthusiasm which the present-day Englishman, for instance, feels for his national Church is unquestionably very much mixed up with the enthusiasm which he feels for England. But it is wonderful how little the New Testament has to say about the duty of patriotism. When clergymen are minded to preach political sermons, they commonly are driven to the books of the Old Testament in search of their texts. The polity of Jesus Christ is ecumenical, not national. When in his character of conqueror He goes forth to war, his "far-flung battle-line" reaches to the ends of the earth. In the beginnings of his ministry, He had, indeed, much to say of a special mission to Israel. His language to more than one of the foreigners with whom He was brought in contact had a distinctly Hebraic tincture. But as the end draws near, the catholic scope of his mission is disclosed. "And I, if I be lifted up," He cried, "will draw all men unto Me."

It was in this sense that Paul, from the outset, understood his Master. Language more comprehensive than St. Paul's with respect to the largeness

of the Kingdom, it would be impossible to frame. If he mentions national and race distinctions, it is only that he may slur them. No Jacobin or Internationalist was ever more intolerant of patriotism, in the narrow sense, than he. He valued his Roman citizenship, to be sure, for, as a man of sense, he was not indifferent to the practical advantages which it secured; but whenever it was seen to be a question of the Kingdom, Scythian and barbarian drew upon his sympathies, and challenged his interest as powerfully as the best Roman of them all. We must therefore, as I said, concede to the Ultramontanist a superiority over the Nationalist as touching the aims which the two respectively hold up to themselves. How, then, are we to avoid the conclusion that it is our duty as good Christians, pupils of the New Testament rather than of the Old, to forsake nationalism altogether, and to follow the Ultramontanist whithersoever he may lead, even though our doing so take us across the mountains, and bring us to the city where the man holding the keys sits? We cannot avoid that conclusion, save by taking the ground that nationalism in religion is a temporary expedient, a policy forced upon us by the necessities of the present, and destined in due time, unless indeed the course of this world be meanwhile interrupted by the personal coming of the King, to merge in the larger *ecclesia* in which are to be gathered all the nations of the earth. The Ultramontanist's error is not in claiming a world-wide dominion for

the Church,— there he is right; but rather in failing to see that the Church of Rome, magnificent as her career has been, and deep as our gratitude to her must always be, was never, after all, anything but a national Church herself, and that hence her attempt to administer this modern world which long since ceased to be a single nation is an anachronism. If at this the Ultramontanist turns upon us, as he is very likely to do, with a charge of inconsistency, in that we acknowledge the necessarily fragmentary and inchoate character of national Churches, but at the same time have no scheme to offer for an ecumenical polity that shall be large enough for the whole world, our answer is the old one that Moses gave to Pharaoh when the king sought to bind him down to terms in the matter of the exodus, "We know not with what we must serve the Lord until we come thither." Even so we Nationalists know not precisely what will be the proper ecclesiastical framework for "the Federation of the World" until we "come thither." Certainly that goal is far enough away at present, nor may we hope to see it heave in sight until what our Lord, in a most suggestive phrase, calls "the times of the Gentiles" shall have been fulfilled.

For the present it is plain that the Sovereign Commander of all the world has use for nations; and since no one of these nations can interfere in the internal affairs of any other one without there ensuing a clash of sovereignties, the best that the

Christianity of each nation can do is to orb itself into a unity of its own. The Roman Church seeks to avoid this difficulty by its device of *concordats*,— solemn treaties, that is to say, negotiated from time to time between the papal see and the various governments of Christendom, whereby certain rights and privileges are guaranteed by the secular to the sacred society; but the fact that it has proved impossible to carry out this scheme with anything like symmetrical completeness would seem to be the sufficient condemnation of the principle upon which it is based. The method of the *concordat* offers too many opportunities for intrigue. It tempts the Church into the sins that beset diplomacy. It is only too likely to promote a substitution of finesse and adroitness for the transparent sincerity which Christ and His Apostles twelve commend.

But it is urged, and with much show of reason, that it will not do to intrust the Christian religion to the nations in severalty, since there is a danger, if we do so, that the substance of the faith may suffer wrong, may be depraved in quality or impoverished in quantity. The argument by aid of which the Roman Church defends its continued use of the Latin tongue for the purposes of worship is this, that there would be danger of the liturgy's becoming corrupt were it to be translated into the various languages of the modern world. The Mass, it is urged, might under such circumstances grow to mean one thing to one people and another to another.

If this reasoning holds good with respect to the liturgy, with tenfold force must it apply to dogma. "What guarantee have we," asks the Ultramontanist, "that the very essence of the faith itself may not be at any moment put in jeopardy, if each national Church is to be allowed to frame its own doctrinal system, lengthen or shorten its creed at will?"

This raises at once the whole question of the basis of authority in matters of religious belief, and brings nationalist and infallibilist face to face.

There was a time when Mother Church could hush inquiry, as any mother hushes any child, with a "Never mind 'Why?' Believe what I tell you because it is I who tell you; do as I bid you because it is I who bid you." The sixteenth century movement upset all that, and by a somewhat rough process drove the children into inquiring for themselves, not always wisely, though always eagerly, as to what the truth might be with regard to the foundations of faith. To-day, whether you are undertaking to tell a man what he ought to believe or what he ought to do, he is equally likely to turn on you with a peremptory and unceremonious Why? Alike on *agenda* and on *credenda* is stamped the interrogation mark.

Just at present the storm-centre happens to be immediately over Holy Scripture. We have fallen upon times when the well-worn formula, "The Bible, and the Bible only, the Religion of Protestants," scarcely suffices for controversial needs.

The issues of to-day lie back of the Bible, and it is no longer possible to silence the inquirer by throwing a text at him. Men have raised the question, "What is the Bible?" and they are discussing it in hot earnest. You and I believe that the Bible is coming out of the fires stronger than ever, but we must not let that belief blind us to our need of authoritative guidance in the interpretation of the book. The individual mind is not sufficient for these things, it must have help. A deep philosophy underlay the question with which an ancient Bible-student parried the inquiry, "Understandest thou what thou readest?" "How can I, except some man should guide me?"

There are four possible ways of construing the promise of Christ that the Spirit should guide the disciples into all the truth; we may call them, respectively, the pietistic, the patristic, the infallibilist, and the ecumenical. The pietistic theologian (and I use the adjective not contemptuously, but only with a view to clearness) finds in Christ's promise an encouragement to the individual believer to count upon ascertaining in every instance the true meaning of psalm, parable, and prophecy, if only he read his Bible with an honest prayer upon his lips for spiritual light. It will scarcely be alleged, even by the most ardent devotees of this method, that it conduces to corporate unity. They are more likely to take the ground that corporate unity is a delusion and a snare; glorying in rather

than lamenting over the diversity of result which the working out of this theory of interpretation brings to pass. Their appeal is to the heavenly city, and they are quite content to postpone the accomplishment of any unity, other than an emotional one to the celestial calends.

What the far future is to the pietist, that, as respects the secret of outward doctrinal agreement, the far past is to the man who stakes everything upon the Fathers. For the one the golden age lies distantly ahead; for the other, that blessed era was hermetically sealed up centuries ago. If you want to know the mind of the Spirit as it was originally injected into Holy Scripture, provide yourself with a Library of the Fathers (the Benedictine edition is the best), and, wholly oblivious to the changes which fifty generations of Christian study and Christian discovery have wrought in the intellectual sky, give yourself patiently to the task of disengaging from a badly tangled skein the one precious thread of unanimous patristic consent. This is what is known as the appeal to antiquity. That it has immense value as an element in the ascertainment of truth only a smatterer in theology will deny. To put it forward as the alone all-sufficient organon is to court discomfiture.

The retroactive influence which too much harping upon this single string, "antiquity," exerted over the mind of a well-remembered ecclesiastic of our day had much to do with bringing to a head the

third of the four great theories, — the infallibilist. Henry Edward, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, had heard so much, while an Anglican, about the authority of the Fathers, that he had grown into that mood of mind which prompted Coleridge in an impatient moment to cry out, "Evidences of Christianity, I am weary of the word." Manning grew weary of "antiquity." He had the eye to see that there were a good many anxious questions floating about in the modern atmosphere which the Fathers, whether Ante-Nicene or Post-Nicene, had never so much as touched with the tips of their fingers; and it was deeply borne in upon his mind that it would be an immense relief to see established somewhere — and if somewhere, where so appropriately as at Rome? — an oracle of present-day truth to which discouraged seekers might resort with confidence. Aided by others like-minded with himself, he brought to pass, in the memorable year of our Lord 1870, the enactment by the Vatican Council of a constitution the most significant passage of which reads as follows: —

"The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, is, through the divine assistance promised him in blessed Peter, possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed in defining doctrine

about faith and morals, and therefore such definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable of themselves and not from the consent of the Church." [1]

The facts with regard to the passing of this resolve are these: The whole number of prelates entitled to take part in the proceedings of the Council was one thousand and thirty-seven. Of these the largest number present at any one session was seven hundred and twenty-seven. At the first ballot, which was held on the thirteenth day of July, six hundred and one members were present. Of these four hundred and fifty-one voted Aye, eighty-eight Nay, and sixty-two *Placet juxta modum*, or "Aye, with qualifications." At the solemn session, or, as we should call it, the "formal ballot," on the eighteenth day of July, when the final vote was taken, five hundred and thirty-five prelates participated, of whom five hundred and thirty-three voted *Placet*, and two *Non placet*. The two dissenters subsequently gave in their adhesion. From these figures it appears that on the occasion when the balloting was entirely unbiassed, that is to say, at the session of July the thirteenth, those who voted *Placet* had a majority

[1] "*Romanum Pontificem, cum ex Cathedra loquitur, id est cum omnium Christianorum pastoris et doctoris munere fungens pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa ecclesia tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate pollere, qua divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definima doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit; ideoque ejusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiæ irreformabiles esse.*" — Constitut. Dogmat. Prima. Cap. IV.

of one hundred and fifty out of a total of six hundred and one present and voting, although they were less numerous by five hundred and eighty-six than the whole number entitled to attend the Council. With this hollow show of unanimity was promulgated the most momentous decree of modern times. It is said that during that solemn hour a heavy storm passed over the city where the Council was assembled, darkening the spaces of the great church, and punctuating the decree with thunder-peals. Can we wonder that the omen should have been variously interpreted,— that some should have been quick to say, "It is the voice of an angel," while others murmured beneath their breath, "It is the *Non placet* of Almighty God"?

Time will show which augury was true, and which was false. For there is but one pair of alternatives. The papal claim to be, in the last resort, the sole arbiter of the things that most concern our peace is either just or unjust; it is quite impossible that it should be both. If Jesus Christ really speaks by Leo, to Leo we must go. If, on the other hand, the decree of July was but the capstone of an edifice already undermined, and doomed as soon as finished to vanish away, nothing so much behooves us as to find a basis of authority not liable to shock, some floor broad enough and strong enough for the nations to build upon it and be safe.

In what I have further to say, my endeavor will be to show that we have such a foundation. A phi-

losophy there is which at once strikes deeper than the pietistic and stretches farther than the patristic theory. It recognizes and allows for an important element of truth in each of these others, while it superadds an increment of value which is all its own. I have called it, for lack of a better name, the ecumenical philosophy of authority. It is a philosophy adherence to which will save a national Church from lapsing into provincialism, while at the same time safeguarding it from the encroachments of any alleged Mother and Mistress of all Churches.

This philosophy is summed up in the brief maxim of St. Augustine, which Cardinal Newman has made famous, *Securus judicat orbis terrarum.* In that most instructive of all autobiographies, "The History of my Religious Opinions," better known under its first title, *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, Newman gives us a graphic account of the manner in which that sonorous sentence of the great Latin Father broke on his conscience like a revelation. He calls them "palmary words." They kept ringing in his ears. He found himself repeating them again and again. "The words of St. Augustine," he says, "struck me with a power which I had never felt from any words before. To take a familiar instance, they were like the 'Turn again, Whittington,' of the chime; or, to take a more serious one, they were like the '*Tolle, lege*, — *Tolle, lege*,' of the child which converted St. Augustine himself. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum.* By those great words of the ancient Father,

interpreting and summing up the long and varied course of ecclesiastical history, the theory of the *Via Media* was absolutely pulverized."[1]

How little did the proud, eager, passionate soul of John Henry Newman dream that in less than six years after the making of this frank disclosure of the chief reason that had carried him to Rome, he would himself be called upon to accept, at the very point of the sword, as we may say, a doctrine of religious certitude the very opposite of the one he here so eloquently sets forth. He turned his face Romeward because he had become convinced that England was in isolation, and that only the voice of the Church Catholic (for so he translated Augustine's *orbis terrarum*) could be trusted; but he had not been long housed in his new spiritual home before he was informed that not at the lips of the *orbis terrarum* at all, but rather at the lips of a single ecclesiastic enthroned at the capital of a dead empire, he was thenceforth to drink in truth. It was like being called upon to exchange the voice of many waters for the piping of a phonograph, — an instrument which only reproduces words that have been put into it. Can we wonder that in a hasty moment, as he saw the evil day approaching, he should have characterized as "an insolent faction" the people who were moving sea and land to bring about the definition of the new dogma?

The late Dean Stanley is credited with the epi-

[1] *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, p. 118, Am. ed.

grammatic remark, "How differently might the history of the Church of England have read if Dr. Newman had only understood German!" An American Christian may be pardoned for adding, "How differently might Dr. Newman have translated Augustine's *Securus judicat orbis terrarum* had he once put the Atlantic between himself and the Europe of his studies!" For truly the *orbis terrarum* has become a different thing from what it was in the day when the son of Monica looked out upon it and put his trust in its judgment. But his argument has lost nothing of its strength; on the contrary, it has been found to possess a cumulative value, gaining in force from century to century as man becomes more and more aware of the largeness of the plans of God. The world of Augustine's time was a "round world," in the sense in which a circle is round,—there was doubt as to its circumference, but practically no doubt as to its centre; our round world is round in the sense in which a globe is round,—we are certain of its circumference, but no spot upon its surface can claim to be an exclusive centre any longer; and yet by so much as a sphere is better than a surface, by that much is the argument from general consent, which is what the *Securus judicat orbis terrarum* really means, stronger to-day than it ever was. It has been to our advantage, not our loss, that "umbilical" and "ecumenical" have ceased to be convertible terms.

But let us not dwell in parables. The thesis I

seek to maintain, as the point most central to an ecumenical philosophy of authority in the region of religious belief, is this, that Christ's promise[1] of the guidance of the Spirit runs to the Church as a whole, to the *ecclesia diffusa*, and is self-registering from age to age. This is not a theory which will satisfy precise minds that must have everything cut and dried, and cannot believe that God will ever do a new thing unless they personally shall have been informed as to the when and where of the birth; but possibly it may commend itself to those who, patiently pondering in a docile temper the general drift of things, have learned to account deliberateness one of the most infallible notes of divinity.

In effect, this was the method by which the two burning questions of the early Church — the question of the canon of Holy Scripture and the question of the limits of the catholic Creed — were settled. The Councils which dealt with these questions did but gather to a head and put into more definite shape what was generally held among the faithful to be the truth of the matter. The Bishops were representative men, who came together, not for the purpose of concocting anything of their own, but simply to report what it was that in their several neighborhoods was commonly believed. This is the way St. Luke puts it in the Preface to his Gospel. Others, he says, have written their narratives concerning those matters which have been fully established, and now he proposes to add his.

[1] St. John xvi. 13.

Really it was the steady, unnoticed, pervasive action of the *ecclesia diffusa*, in a word, the general belief, the public opinion of the early Church, which settled both the Canon and the Creed. This public opinion found a mouthpiece in Councils, but it existed before the Councils were convened, and was the implicit even before it had become the explicit belief of the Church. This is in line with what the best theologians have always held with respect to General Councils; namely, that they ought not to be accounted "general" until there has been time enough to ascertain whether their findings be acceptable to the Church at large. The Church, not the Council, is the Spirit-bearing body; it is to the whole Church rather than to its representative assembly that the promise of guidance runs; and although Councils are of the greatest value as a means of ascertaining what the mind of the Church is, nevertheless, if it be made afterwards perfectly plain by the course of events, that any Council, instead of having fairly represented, did really misrepresent the actual mind of the Church with respect to some disputed point, that Council must be content to go into history with a black mark against its name. This is really very High Church doctrine, although the fact that I am assigning so much importance to the rank and file of the Christian body, and comparatively so little to the official portion of it, may blind the eyes of some to the true character of my contention.

Assuredly it is no slight or cheap prerogative that

one claims for the Church Catholic when he sets it up as the umpire and teacher of the human race, maintaining, as I am seeking to maintain, that its united testimony with respect to any matter of faith or morals comes nearer to an infallible utterance than any other voice which it is given to man to hear. The saints shall judge the world.

Do you complain that the doctrine is shadowy and nebulous as compared with the crisp and handy formula of the Vatican Council? No doubt it is open to that charge; and probably no single incentive to the promulgation of the infallibility dogma was more powerful than the desire to cut short debate over disputes which refused to be settled other than by the old and wearisome process of simmering and simmering until the public opinion of the Church at large should confess itself content. It was like the introduction of the parliamentary device known as the closure, or a moving of "the previous question" in an assembly sick and weary of the prolixities of debate. But if it be true, and the wise and good assure us it is, that things are never settled until they are settled right, the slow way may prove the better way, in fact, the only way. "Closure" and "previous question" are all very well, where it is a matter of adjourning and going home to luncheon; but for the purposes of such legislation as is expected to survive and to endure, nothing is one half so good as "general consent," even if it has to be waited for with long patience, like the early and the latter rain.

But "nebulous" and "shadowy" are not the only epithets of dispraise which the ecumenical theory of authority is likely to draw to itself. It will be called foolhardy and hare-brained, because of its seeming to launch a very precious freight upon a most tenuous and impalpable medium, — an iron-clad, for instance, upon a sea of vapor which only simulates the great deep. But even so, there is still the question, What is Almighty God's own method of launching?

Foolhardy, indeed, at its first announcement, must have seemed that theory of the heavenly mechanics which knocked all visible supports from under sun and moon and planets, leaving them, one and all, balanced apparently on nothing.

We think otherwise to-day, for we have learned that the all-pervasive, everywhere energizing force which really holds the stars to their courses, is a far better guarantee of order, a far more trustworthy underpinning than any celestial trestle-work, whether of steel or adamant. Surely, what gravitation does for stars the eternal Spirit may be counted upon to do for souls, holding them invisibly to a unity in the truth which no mechanical device of ecclesiasticism such as the dogma of 1870 possibly can produce.

"God builds on liquid air;" the beams of his chambers are laid on ocean's unstable floor; yet is there no sub-structure so secure as his, for He hath founded it upon the seas and established it upon the floods. Poor Simon Peter, like his putative successor, Pio Nono, was unequal to this conception of what firm

footing means. He, too, was struck with a sudden panic as to this question of support from underneath. Beginning to sink, he cried, "Lord, save me." How gentle but how searching Christ's lesson in the first principles of certitude, "O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?"

Again, it will be said that this ecumenical theory of authority never can compete with Vaticanism, because what is wanted is a court of immediate resort. Rome is accessible, we are acquainted with its latitude and longitude, we know its place upon the map, and we can journey thither with our hard questions any day we will; whereas the twenty-first century is a long way off, and none of us can hope to live to see the day when by patient brooding over the mind of the Church the Holy Spirit of Truth shall have brought to pass general consent as to the doubts and difficulties that now so grievously oppress us. But has Ultramontanism as a matter of fact the superiority in this respect that is claimed for it? Can answers be extracted from the oracle at Rome as promptly as the vulgar suppose? What is the advantage of a rapid-firing gun if one never fires it? Since the promulgation of the Vatican decree, the Roman Pontiff has written a number of letters to the world, embracing, in all, many hundreds of propositions; but it does not appear that infallibility is claimed for any single one of these propositions, inasmuch as the letters containing them are not known to have been issued *ex cathedra*, — in accordance, that

is to say, with the conditions which the dogma of 1870 itself lays down as necessary to the putting forth of an inerrant utterance.

While, therefore, the letters are plainly valuable on account of the large measure of wholesome and timely truth which they contain, they do not essentially differ in character from letters of counsel that reach us from other ecclesiastical sources, as, for example, the mild pastoral set forth by the recent Anglican Conference at Lambeth. In fact, it seems probable that the Holy See, under the new constitution, will never commit itself irrevocably to either side of any momentous controversy, whether ecclesiastical, theological, or social, until the straw shall have been thoroughly thrashed out, and a practical unanimity, at least within the Roman Communion, already reached. It need not, therefore, necessarily be conceded to the Ultramontanists that their theory has even the poor advantage of celerity in its favor. Appeal still lies with them, as with us, to the next age.[1]

[1] "I know well that the decree in question is capable of many interpretations. There is a sense in which it expresses, I will not say a truth, but even a truism. When the Pope speaks as the representative of the Church, he cannot but speak truly. I grant it. The question is, When does the Pope speak as the representative of the Church? A Roman Catholic of my acquaintance ventured to talk to Leo XIII. about this dogma, and the obstacle which it presented to reunion between England and him. The Pope was distressed, and said that the dogma must be explained. . . . 'The truth,' he said, pointing to his own breast, 'is not in me but in the Church.' He needed, he said, to take the proper means to find out the truth, before he could pronounce.

And, after all, why should we fret against the fact that under any system time must always be an important element in the task of ascertaining truth? How was the slavery question finally settled in Christendom? Certainly not by the vote of any ecclesiastical Council; certainly not by the formal decree of any Pope: it was settled by a slow process in which orators, divines, jurists, story-writers, and soldiers, all of them had part. The Spirit of Truth certainly did not make the Bishops and Clergy the only instruments in this vast work, but all estates of men in God's holy Church, from the highest to the lowest, bore severally their parts. It was the Christian *Orbis Terrarum* exercising its high right of giving final judgment.

This is an ethical illustration. A theological one would be equally to the point. How has the question of the six days of creation been settled, and from having been an open become a closed one? Has it been by conciliar vote? No. Has it been by papal bull? No. How then? By general consent. Gradually the truth with respect to questions that have been long vexed gets into the atmosphere, and the Church finds herself saying, "Whereas I was blind, now I see." Christians believe that this slow but sure illuminating process is the work of the Spirit of Truth; that it is in fulfilment of a definite promise made by the incarnate Son of God; and they account

It was a very true sentiment; but if it is true, then the practical value of the dogma is gone." — Mason's *Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity*, p. 112.

for the more swift advance of the Christianized as compared with the non-Christianized peoples of the world, by alleging this cause.

I have endeavored to show that in the all-important region of faith and doctrine, it is possible for a national Church, however it may be limited in other directions, to hold ecumenical ground. I have laid the main stress here, because without a clear philosophy of authority back of it a national Church can neither understand itself nor justify itself. It may seem to some that the argument has been unduly labored, and that I might safely have treated the newly formulated papal claim as a negligible quantity.

Others, however, will perhaps agree with me in thinking that the world has not yet begun to appreciate the full significance of what was effected under St. Peter's dome in 1870. In religious controversy, definiteness counts for very, very much. Devout minds, especially the minds of devout women (and we must remember that the interests of religion are largely in the custody of women), yield readily to the fascination of a sufficiently emphatic "Thus saith the Lord." Logical and scientific difficulties such as those suggested by the dogma of transubstantiation; questions of historical accuracy like those that encumber the Petrine claim; even ethical misgivings prompted by the abuses of the Confessional, the doctrine of indulgences, and the cultus of the saints, — will all of them sometimes fade swiftly away in the face of the strong assertion, "Rome has spoken; the

case is closed." In this world of dimmed eyes and wayward wills, absolutism has a charm all its own. The Roman Empire dies hard. It is a flippant mind that can lightly cast ridicule upon the Holy Father's tremendous claim. Some of the keenest thinkers of our day, men not easily fooled, have succumbed to the magic of it.

So ardent, in deep natures, is the longing for the full assurance of downright conviction, so quenchless the thirst for certitude, that the mere spectacle of a venerable teacher who demands assent to what he says on the plea of a divine right is of itself eloquent with persuasion. Almost any harbor that offers anchorage is grateful to storm-beaten and half-shipwrecked men.

> "Surely, surely, slumber is more sweet than toil, the shore
> Than labor in the deep mid-ocean, wind and wave and oar;
> Oh, rest ye, brother-mariners, we will not wander more."

The struggle which culminated in the Roman Communion in 1870 is the old struggle between centralization and that genuine catholicity which would render to every member of the vast body its due. In civil society the contention has gone on under the style, Monarch *versus* People; in the spiritual society under the style, Pope *versus* Council. The plea I have been making is identical, though put forward under a somewhat altered form, with that by which the great politicians of the Church of England have stood fast ever since Trent. The appeal of England

was, in a sense, an appeal to antiquity, in that it insisted on Holy Scripture and the primitive Creeds as the all-sufficient reservoir of revealed truth; but that appeal had also in it, be it noted, a present-day element, in that it made petition for a fair and truly representative General Council, so constituted as to do full justice (as for obvious reasons Trent could not do) to all the interests of Christendom.

In the supreme position assigned to Holy Scripture and the Creeds, the pietistic and the patristic schools have found, and rightly enough, their stronghold; while in the demand for the fair General Council there has lain latent all along that recognition of our need of a present-day interpretative voice which, as I have sought to show, only the common consent of the best minds and hearts of Christendom can be counted upon to meet and satisfy. "I read," said the late Sir John Seeley, "the Bible and the Times."

It is certainly among things conceivable — who shall say that it is not? — that God in his providence may be preparing the way for a General Council of Christendom that shall be truly such. If a Parliament of Religions is possible, surely a gathering representative of Christendom ought not to be impossible. It may be that the convening of such a Council will prove itself the ripest outcome of, and the worthiest employment for, the marvellous facilities for intercourse which modern inventiveness — the child, be it observed, of Christian faith — has made ready. Curiously enough, these new-fangled contrivances lend

themselves with almost equal readiness and efficiency to both of the two philosophies of authority we have been studying. On the one hand, telegraph and telephone may be so employed as to turn the Vatican into a veritable "Ear of Dionysius," where shall be audible whisperings from every remotest corner of the Pontiff's world-wide realm; while, on the other hand, transcontinental railroads and the great ocean-liners have brought the ends of the earth so close together that never, since the days when James of Jerusalem could convene the Church at a few hours' notice, have the physical difficulties in the way of assembling a truly Ecumenical Council been so few as they are now. Perhaps there was more of literalness in John the Baptist's prophecy than has commonly been supposed; and perhaps all this filling up of valleys, levelling of hills, and general shortening and straightening of paths and ways may have for its chief object that drawing together of the scattered family of man which is destined to make government by "general consent," or, as they called it on the day of Pentecost, "one accord," a more practicable thing than government by edict and emissary, rescript and concordat.

I speak of what is far away; but meanwhile, and pending time's answer — nay, let us rather say God's answer — to the appeal of the Protestant peoples for a fair hearing in council assembled, surely our best interpreter, alike of Holy Scripture and of current events, is that *communis sensus* of the Church Uni-

versal which somehow we contrive to get at, if only we are patient, and from which there is seldom, if ever, any going back. One of the oldest of Greek proverbs says that "the half is greater than the whole." Would you be a good Catholic? Be a good Nationalist first. The rest will come in time.

II.

PRACTIBILITY.

II.

PRACTICABILITY.

From the philosophical, we pass to the practical aspects of national churchmanship, as these disclose themselves in our own land.

The moment we do this, we are confronted by a startling spectacle, — a vision which seems to negative all hope; which looks to be, so far as any prospect of unity is concerned, a veritable apocalypse of despair. I know of no book which an intelligent American who is both a lover of his country and a believer in the teachings of Jesus Christ, is under a more solemn obligation to study than that volume of the United States Census of 1890 which deals with the statistics of religion.[1] Aside from all ecclesiastical interests, the work is worthy of attention on its own merits. Merely as a sociological achievement, it ranks with such monumental achievements as Charles Booth's Enquiry into the Industrial Condition of the London Poor.

Whether as respects ingenuity of method, fairness of treatment, or thoroughness of detail, Dr. Carroll's

[1] Conveniently summarized in *The Religious Forces of the United States.* By H. K. Carroll, LL.D., in charge of the Division of Churches, Eleventh Census. New York: The Christian Literature Co.

conduct of the exceedingly delicate task intrusted to him has been beyond praise. It is doubtful whether in any language there exists a conspectus of the religious statistics of a people so complete as that which he and his able helpers have succeeded in putting before us. In English there is nothing that approaches it. Not only are the figures with respect to denominational strength marshalled and re-marshalled in almost all possible combinations; not only are we told all there is to be known as to number of communicants, number of clergy, number of church edifices, value of property, and the like; but by a most suggestive, I had almost said amusing, employment of graphic symbols, the condition of things, both in the Union as a whole and in the separate States, is made vividly evident to the eye. We look, for instance, at a circle entitled Maryland (I choose my example at random), and we find it divided by radii into eight sectors, each with a color of its own, and variously named as follows: "Catholic," "Methodist," "Lutheran," "Episcopalian," "Baptist," "Presbyterian," "Reformed," "All Other," — the "All Other" sector being in the case of this particular State, Maryland, about one-thirteenth portion of the whole area of the circle, while the Catholic and the Methodist sectors cover, each of them, about one-third of the space enclosed. If, again, we take the case of Ohio, we see the circle divided into nine sectors, entitled respectively: "Catholic," "Methodist," "Presbyterian," "Lutheran," "Baptist," "Disciples of Christ," "United

Brethren," "Reformed," "All Other." In this circle the "Catholic" sector covers one-quarter of the area, instead of one-third as in the case of Maryland; the "Methodist" sector suffers similar shrinkage; the "Baptist" sector (and, by the way, how admirably this word "sector" seems to harmonize with the whole business!) remains about what it was in the older State, while the "Episcopalian" sector suffers the mortification of being merged in the sad promiscuity of the quadrant known as "All Other." If, now, we pass Mason and Dixon's line and go down into the Gulf States, we find in the case of Georgia a circle with only three sectors, respectively entitled "Baptist," "Methodist," and "All Other." This is balanced, and more than balanced, at the far West, by New Mexico, where the "All Other" sector covers only one-fourteenth portion of the area, the entire remainder of the circle being marked "Catholic."

Among the most interesting circles by way of suggestion and reminiscence are Massachusetts and Virginia; Massachusetts, the Puritan Commonwealth, showing a space of two-thirds marked "Catholic," and another of one-tenth marked "Congregationalist;" while in the home of the Cavaliers we have one full half "Baptist," one full quarter "Methodist," and a little less than one-twentieth "Episcopalian." If, last of all, we turn our attention to the great circle which represents the entire Republic, we note that the "Catholic" sector covers a little more than one-third of the whole area, the "Methodist" a little

more than one-fourth, the "Baptist" something less than one-fifth, the "Presbyterian" about one-fifteenth, and the "Protestant Episcopalian" almost exactly one thirty-ninth.

But this is a cheerful showing for unity compared with what we have to face when we turn from the graphic method of circles to the numerical method of tables. In the device of the circle all kinds of Presbyterians are massed in a single sector, and all kinds of Methodists in another single sector, and all kinds of Baptists in another single sector; but as a matter of fact there are twelve different denominations of Presbyterians, thirteen varieties of Baptists, and seventeen sorts of Methodists.

In the case of the circles, the cumulative in contrast with the particularist method was forced upon Dr. Carroll by the exigencies of the situation; for had he undertaken to intersect the sectors by radii numerous enough to represent all of these distinctions, and the sub-dichotomies covered by the vague phrase "All Other" as well, the eye of the student would have been hopelessly confused and the intent of the graphic device defeated. Moreover, in the matter of tints and shading, chromo-lithography would have been utterly unequal to the task.

But let us face the worst at once. The tables show that there are in the United States one hundred and forty-three distinct religious denominations. It should be noted, however, that this generous figure includes Jews, Theosophists, Ethical Culturists, and some thirty

organizations that number fewer than one thousand adherents apiece. Of professedly Christian denominations claiming, severally, upwards of ten thousand members, there are *sixty-three*, ranging from the Roman Catholics with their six millions to the Danish Lutherans with their ten thousand one hundred and eighty-one. The scandal of the situation is somewhat further relieved, when we find, as we do find if we look into the matter, that the most of these organizations fall easily into families, the bond of kinship being either a common doctrine or a common polity.

If we classify the denominations according to this affinity-scheme, as we may call it, and agree to recognize as important only such families as lay claim to a quarter of a million of members, we shall find that we have reduced the number of our varieties to ten, which ten comprise almost, if not quite, nineteen-twentieths of all communicants, of whatever name, within our borders.

So, then, here lies the practical question with which we have to grapple: Is there discoverable any persuasive or conciliatory method of bringing these ten types of Christian life and thought, these ten tribes as we may call them, into such a relation with one another, that as Americans we may look forward not merely to a retention of our common Christianity, but to the gradual emergence of a national Church really worthy of the name? At first we are disposed to say, "No. These great buildings scare us." Great buildings always do have a tendency to enslave the imagi-

nation. And yet, I confess, I can think of no loftier employment for the ecclesiastical mind, nay, for the patriotic mind, of the coming century than a thorough study of this question would afford.

Surely the time has come for a turn of the tide. The *reductio ad absurdum* of sectarianism, as a philosophy of Christianity, is complete. It has been wittily said[1] that the Kansas farmer of to-day, when the crops fail, instead of trying, as his father would have done, to improve the quality or the quantity of the fertilizers, lets his hair grow long and starts a new political party; but few indeed are they who, with our present light, would dream of seeking to improve the ratio of wheat to tares in our American harvest field by organizing to-morrow a new split. As a people we have ceased to believe any longer in sectarianism; but the task of doing away with the thing, now that it has been saddled upon us, looms so large as almost to incapacitate us for effort.[2] We see clearly enough that this jumble of fragments has no proper claim to be called a national Church, and yet we have mournfully to confess that, taken in its entirety, it is the nearest approach to a national Church that we can show.

[1] By Professor Peck, of Columbia University.

[2] "There can be no doubt that the reason why many minds abandon the doctrine of unity, as it was believed by Christendom for fifteen hundred years, is that they are at a loss how to square it with the anomalies of the last three centuries. But for the unhappy rending of the Western Church, no man would have any more dreamed of gainsaying the mystery of the visible Church than of the visible sacraments. Men's minds have been bribed by their wishes, or perplexed by their difficulties, into lower and looser conceptions of unity." — Manning's *Unity of the Church*, p. 302, Am. ed.

Almost all are ready to admit that we have had disintegration enough, and that what we want now is construction. The thing that takes the heart out of us is the immensity of the undertaking. We feel as a tribe of savages might feel if shown the "Teutonic" or the "Campania," and told to substitute that type of boat for their dug-outs and canoes. And yet the ocean liner is but the final term in a long process of evolution from the dug-out. With God all things are possible; and with man, God helping him, more things are possible than we dare dream.

Weary of squabbles over tariffs and inter-state commerce acts, we need in this country the inspiration of some splendid purpose. It may be asked, has many times been asked, will often be asked again: What would your national Church accomplish, supposing it came about, which the present conglomerate of sects cannot already do for us fairly well?

For an answer to this question we should look both abroad and at home. Briefly put, the answer is, that abroad we should be saved the spectacle of half a dozen competing divinity schools in Tokyo; and that at home the maintenance of religion in our villages and towns would cease to be dependent on the uncertainties of "pink teas" and the doubtful aid of amateur theatricals. When dignity wholly disappears from the administration of religion, reverence presently takes wing. It is perfectly possible for worship to be dignified, even in dens and caves of the earth; it is not possible for dignity to coexist with a scramble; and who will deny

that in small communities where every man and every dollar tells, the sectarian principle, from its very nature, necessarily entails a scramble. Moreover, the impression made upon the mind of the young by the spectacle of a splintered Christianity is the reverse of favorable. Accustomed to see law presenting itself in the courts with a united front, the young man learns to respect law. Were there as many competing temples of justice in an American city as there are rival temples of religion, the young man would be as quick to unlearn civic virtue as he is now disposed to throw up Christian faith. I shall never forget the impression made upon my mind in early life by my first sight of a Roman Catholic village with its great Church overtopping all roofs. Visible unity inspires respect, visible disintegration genders contempt.

The Colonies would never have become The United States had the patriots of that day reasoned with respect to civil nationality after the fashion in which too many of us reason about ecclesiastical nationality. Most certainly, after having lumped together a republic in Massachusetts, a democracy in Rhode Island, a monarchy in New York, and an aristocracy in New Jersey, they would have declined to call the resulting amorphous mass a nation. The conveners of the Continental Congress knew too much for that. You tell me that those men had physical force at their disposal and felt no scruple about using it. That is very true; but it does not annul my contention that the unity

which hopes to escape ridicule and to challenge respect must be an evident and palpable thing, not one that has to be continually explaining away appearances that make it seem the very opposite of what it claims to be. A national Church would be, if nothing else, a great evidence of religion.

The child who in a New England village of two hundred years ago saw, or in a South German village of to-day habitually sees, all the people passing on the Lord's Day through one porch into the Lord's House, grew up and grows up taking religion for granted. The American child of the present generation who sees his playmates, on six days of the week, go through the one school-house door, and on the one day of the week sees six differently labelled church doors crying out to the same boys and girls "Come in," inevitably conceives of religion as a matter in debate. "When I grow up," he says to himself, "I will find out what all this means. Somehow it looks as if our fathers and mothers did not feel about praying as they do about schooling." Yes, these things tell. Doubtless in the triumvirate of evil, the world and the flesh are the predominant partners as respects the number of souls enticed away from God; but, in any fair reckoning, the third member of the group, the devil of division, should have his due.

Is it then my hope, you ask, that at some future census, say two hundred years from now (a short time in the life of the Christian Church), the great circle which will then probably be named *North America*

may show the same unbroken disc of color that in the Census of 1890 distinguishes New Mexico? I will not resent being shoved into this corner, but will boldly venture to answer, Yes, I do. For however strenuously I may disbelieve in the method by which ecclesiastical unity has been secured in New Mexico, I do not see how I can disparage the thing itself without by the same token censuring the Founder of the Church. New Mexico may be, and in my judgment is, most unfortunate in its type of Christianity, but in so far as it is at one with respect to what it has, New Mexico is to be congratulated.

Consider the characteristics, the notes, of a possible national Church of the United States. Such a structure would, first of all, possess as a matter of course, a basis of dogma. This foundation would be built, however, not of small bricks, but rather of huge, rough-hewn blocks of the sort that can be counted upon to stay put without cement; solid masses of fact, that is to say, as distinguished from speculation; basaltic rock which critics and controversialists might chip away at, as long as they pleased, without any very serious results. The primitive Creeds, the Apostles' and the Nicene, answer fairly well to this description. To be sure, they are deficient in "anthropology," but, on the other hand, it is to be remembered that they are running over with "Christ his lore." Not that I would speak disrespectfully of the great fabrics of theological thought which solitary thinkers like Aquinas and Calvin or grave assemblies of learned

men have, in former or in recent times, framed and lifted. It is far easier to sneer at such architects than it is to rival their architecture. But the truth is, we need have no fear at all that the Church will ever lack for labored explanations of the full purport of the Christian revelation. That more treasures of knowledge are wrapped up, undiscovered, in the articles of the Creed than have ever yet been dug out of them, is certain. To lay an interdict upon the search after this hidden wealth would be absurd; but, for the very reason that this search is going on continually and with success, a national Church is bound carefully to avoid confusing with the temporary "system" the everlasting Faith. The fact that our "little systems," as the late Laureate contemptuously called them, "have their day and cease to be," is no evidence that in their day, and before they ceased to be, they were not of considerable worth. The "systems" of the alchemists were as much more elaborate than the systems of modern chemistry as the theology of Anselm is more intricate than the theology of Coleridge; and yet it is doubtful whether without Paracelsus and Raymond Lully we should ever have had Faraday and Dumas. The really urgent question is, What is the special need of our day, this present, this modern day that we are living through? And to that inquiry the ancient Creeds make answer by simply holding up before our eyes the person Christ. So much for theology; is it not enough?

And what of ethics? Well, ethics is a form of

dogma, and would be sure to be recognized as such if men could only be persuaded to look deep enough. The words "Thou shalt not steal," if we begin to philosophize about them, are found to appeal to faith quite as strongly as the words "God is One." The fact that the former saying is cast in the imperative mood and the latter in the indicative mood makes no difference; it is in the believing mood that you and I receive them. Well, then, let us apply the same reasoning to ethics that we applied to dogma. A national Church must have an ethical Creed, not voluminous, but clearly legible; not necessarily a code, but most assuredly a standard. We need not postulate a national Church of teetotallers, for instance; but we might as well have no Church at all as one that would admit the drunkard to its privileges. A national Church must not attempt to prove itself such by obliterating all the state-lines of morality. It must not, in a good-natured endeavor to be all things to all men, forget its obligation to be something to some men. There would have to be discipline, not minute, indeed, but real. It would mean a definite thing to be in full communion, and another definite thing not to be in full communion, with the Catholic Church. In a word, to change our figure of speech, as St. Paul when on this subject so easily does his, from stone and mortar to flesh and blood, we must remember that the mystical body of our Lord Jesus Christ, though mystical, is not invertebrate. So much for ethics. Is it not enough?

Well, and what of polity? First of all, let polity,

whatever else it is, be frankly American. I say this in no Jingo spirit. I loathe and detest Jingoism in all its varieties. I know not which is worse, the native or the foreign brand; I abhor them equally. But I am not ashamed of being an American. I should not be running on in this way about national Churches did I not believe in my heart that America, sect-ridden as it is thought to be, offers a better field for the upbuilding of a Church truly national than any other country the world over. Yes, I would see the Church American in its length and breadth. Some people are so nervously afraid of bigness. "Don't let us allow the thing to get too large," they say, "lest we should be unable to manage it." Manage it? And shall not God have care for his elect? "Pray," said the Warden, or Elder (it does not matter which) of an old, ancestral parish somewhere on the North River, to the young minister who was about starting a mission Sunday-school, "Pray, don't introduce a novelty of this sort. What we 've always had up here, and what we want to continue to have, is a nice, snug little Zion of our own." It is this "snug little Zion" idea that has got to be torn up by the roots, if we are ever to know an American Catholic Church. The English ivy is a beautiful plant, and nothing is one-half so becoming to church walls; but unfortunately the English ivy does not flourish in all climates, and to insist that it shall be "ivy or nothing" in a land where the woodbine and other fairly presentable vines are indigenous is a mistake.

It was Mr. Ruskin who said that he would not visit America, because he could not imagine himself content to live three months in a country where there were no castles. That was pardonable enough in Mr. Ruskin, but does his having said it lay any obligation on you and me to try to make good our country's deficiencies by reproducing on a small scale Stirling or Warwick? No, you and I must take America as we find it; comforting ourselves with the thought that Time, as a greater than Ruskin puts it, has a worthier task than merely

> "To make old bareness picturesque,
> And tuft with grass a feudal tower."

Doubtless Americanism may be pushed too far. The demand for a distinctively American doctrine of Church unity is as fatuous as the demand for an American poetry and an American sculpture. Good poetry and good sculpture are what they are, quite independently of national lines. And so with Catholicity; the law of it is as fixed and definite as are the laws of light. It is only when we come to the application of the law that Americanism gets a standing in the court. So then, by all means, let Anglican influences and Anglican precedents be treated with all proper respect, it is but just and right that so it should be; only let us waste no room-rent on the fools' paradise of those who fancy that American Christianity in its entirety can be Anglified. This people is not English, though we owe more to Eng-

land than to all other countries put together; but this people is not English, it is a composite people, now in the course of being kneaded, as a woman kneads the materials of bread, into a homogeneous nationality. To assume that we are dealing with a pure English stock and to base our ecclesiastical polity upon that notion, is to invite collapse. The foundations of an enduring catholicism lie deeper down.

Even the Church of England is not national in the sense of comprising the great bulk of the people of England. It is justly called national, in that it was the core about which the nation, as a matter of historical fact, grew into being. It is national in that it is inwrought, as the late Lord Selborne[1] so conclusively proved, not by the mere letter of a statute, but by a thousand unnoticed ties, into the constitution of the realm. But no one alleges that it has the sympathy or can command the allegiance of the nation as a whole. One may be an Englishman and a loyal Englishman without being an Anglican. Her Majesty herself, the Head of the Church, is a Presbyterian in Edinburgh. And if the American people is far from being English, still farther is the religious portion of the American people from being Anglican. We must remember this in all our reasonings about unity, or we shall go astray.

But there is another feature of the Church of England that entitles her to be called national besides

[1] *A Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment*, by Roundell, Earl of Selborne, pp. 28–31.

the two which I just mentioned, and this other feature is one in which any Church that in any country aspires to become national must resemble her. The Church of England is national, because she lays stress upon territory as such, and counts her children not *per capita* merely, but also in connection with the soil on which their homes are built. There is not a square league of England which is not within the borders of some one or another parish. This is the right principle. If the spiritual interests of a whole people are to be looked after systematically, if they are to be shepherded with thoroughness, there must be a recognition of metes and bounds. The names of St. Paul's Epistles are evidence that he looked at the matter in this light. He did not write out his theological views essay-fashion; what he had to say he put into the form of a letter to the people living in a particular place with a recognized geographical position. The truth taught in the letter may have been one of universal interest; he may even have been setting forth, as in the case of the Colossians, a cosmical theology as wide as the universe; all the same, he addresses himself to "the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse," a town with town limits, a definite unit among the units which in their aggregate make up the Empire.

I am assuming, of course, that the territory in question is both habitable and inhabited. Pretentious paper-schemes which cover deserts and proclaim jurisdiction over wildernesses richly deserve the rid-

icule they receive. But where a territory has a population, the Christian Church should aim at dealing with that population territorially, holding some person or persons answerable for the spiritual well-being of all souls within the boundary lines. This is the theory of the parish system, and it is a good theory. That it is nowhere carried out to perfection is no argument against it. Even the fishermen of the Gospel were under the necessity of mending their nets now and again. In a reticulation that covers a whole country, some meshes, here and there, are bound to get torn and to let through part of the catch.

In this Republic, the obvious territorial units of structure are three in number, — the Union itself, the State, and the County. It is true that a certain portion of the national domain has not yet attained to what, in our political parlance, is known as "statehood;" and it is also true that in Louisiana the divisions elsewhere known as counties are called parishes. But these exceptions are not of a sort to encumber or embarrass the argument. That the Territories are destined, first or last, to be parcelled out into States, is generally acknowledged; while, as for Louisiana, the fact of its having chosen to abide by the old nomenclature of its French period makes no real difference.

Of these three units, the Republic, the State, and the County, the county is, historically speaking, by far the most ancient. In fact, with the exception of the city, there is perhaps no politico-geographical unit

that can show an older lineage than the county. As its name indicates, the county originally made the jurisdiction of a *comes*, or count, so called because the "companion" in administration of the still higher official to whom the government of the province or prefecture as the case might be, had been intrusted. "With that tendency to division and subdivision," says a recent writer[1] on this subject, "which is the mark of thorough government, the provincial empire, at any rate in Western Europe, gradually assumed the shape of a mass of small districts, each administrated by its own *comes*." From continental Europe this county-system passed over into England, and from England was transmitted to America, where it has proved itself so well adapted to our civil needs as to have secured what is practically an universal acceptance. It should be observed, in passing, that organization by counties includes cities, inasmuch as every city is either by itself a county, or else is a constituent portion of some county. If, therefore, the Christian Church in this land is seeking for a self-consistent, easily understood territorial basis of organization, it cannot do better than accept for such a purpose the scheme which Americans in their political capacity have already fastened upon as the best; namely, the Republic, the State, and the County.

But what form shall the polity take on, supposing the territorial scheme to have been adopted? Do not hastily charge me with Erastianism if I invite a return

[1] Mr. Edward Jenks.

to the Census as a means of finding light. Upon consulting such of the tables as bear upon this point we make the cheerful discovery that, as respects polity, there is among our Ten Tribes a far nearer approach to unanimity than one who had been contemplating exclusively their doctrinal divergences would have expected to find. Ecclesiastical polity in this country, it appears, takes on one or other of three forms, according as it inclines to emphasize the principle of home-rule, the principle of counsel and advice, or the principle of a strong executive.

With a view of getting out of the rut, I use these phrases to indicate, respectively, what are commonly known as Congregationalism, Presbyterianism, and Episcopacy. We will waive, for the time being, all *jure divino* points, and look at the whole thing simply as a question of method.

The Congregationalists believe with all their heart in a method which makes much of the local flock looked after by the local shepherd. This, they say, is the true unit, this group of souls, large enough fully to engage the energies of one pastor, and not too large to be gathered within four walls. They remind us that St. Paul speaks of being burdened with the care of all the "Churches," not of "all the Church," and they urge that when he does speak of "the Church" in the singular number, what he has in mind is the choir invisible of faithful souls rather than any hard-and-fast general society by which the whole earth is to be overspread.

The Presbyterians are of opinion that this view of the matter is too loose. They deprecate the isolation of the single flock. They favor consultation among the shepherds, and more concert of action in the matter of tending and feeding the sheep; for after all the flock is one; — that various reading about "the fold" in St. John's tenth chapter does not really work any serious amendment of Christ's parable: the flock is one; we are his people and the sheep of his pasture.

The Episcopalians urge, with a good deal of insistency, the value of headship in everything that has the character of an enterprise. Jesus Christ, they argue, has essayed the spiritual conquest of the world. The task which He has laid upon his followers is a militant task. He sanctioned leadership when He enrolled the Twelve and placed Himself at their head. He sanctioned it again, and for all time, when after his resurrection He said of these same companions of his who had known his mind and become sharers of his purpose, "Go. Preach. Absolve. Baptize." That the Episcopalians would be found so arguing, their very name might have forewarned us. Episcopacy is nothing if not executive, a bishop meaningless save as a leader.

If now we turn to the Census Tables with a view to finding how the religious mind of America stands affected towards these various principles of polity, we discover that of the twenty millions of communicants (I speak in round numbers) nearly six millions are for home-rule, something more than three millions for

recognition of a Church universal administered by the conciliar method, and almost twelve millions for the leadership principle ; in other words, the friends of a polity of oversight outnumber all others by a clear majority of well-nigh three millions, — a striking fact, but one that is robbed of much of its apparent significance when we are told that under this head have been congregated three such dissonant and apparently irreconcilable elements as the Roman Catholics, the Methodists, and the Anglicans.

In quoting these comparative statistics, I am as far as possible from wishing to suggest that the method of arriving at a conclusion in this matter is by count of heads or show of hands; God forbid. Rather my purpose is to argue that since each one of the three methods has so many adherents, the probability is that there must be much good in each ; and that better than the victory of any one would be the prevalence of some wise combination of them all. Why need it be thought a thing impossible that in the course of the next century this should be brought to pass ?

Imagine a county Church. The centre of administration is the county-town. Here dwells the chief pastor of the Christians of the county. His position, although one of dignity, is not one of splendor. His duties are far more urgent than his honors are conspicuous. He is simply the master-missionary of the region, which, although large enough to keep him busy, is not so large as to make the personal care of souls impossible.

From time to time, at stated intervals, there gather about this leader his counsellors, clerical and lay. He and they consult together for the good of religion in the county, talk over the spiritual needs of the various towns and villages, plan anew the ever-shifting campaign, and make provision for the sinews of war. It is not necessary to suppose that all the nominal Christians in the County have given in their adhesion to this arrangement; for the purposes of our "iridescent dream" it will suffice if the great bulk of them have done so.

Well, then, have we not here a microcosm of the United Church? What is lacking? Anything? The home-rule principle has justice done to it; for the local Church of each town, each village, is, as respects the management of its affairs, the choice of its pastor, the handling of its revenues, autonomous. The synodal and conciliar principle has justice done to it; for, instead of each little group of disciples living by itself and for itself, as if no other group existed, we see the representatives of the groups coming together once a year, or as much oftener as may be found desirable, to exchange ideas, and incite one another to better things. The principle of leadership has justice done to it; for, convinced that what is everybody's business is nobody's business, the Christian people of the County have seated at the heart of things one whom they hold in a special sense responsible for the efficient conduct of their affairs. What is there inherently absurd or chimerical in such a picture as this?

The very same three principles work together happily enough in civil polity; what is to prevent their doing so in ecclesiastical polity?

Take a step further. Imagine the overseers of the various counties, together with representative pastors and representative laymen from each county, meeting together once in three years, or oftener if necessary, in the capital city of the State. There are religious interests that people have in common as citizens of the same State other and larger than those which they share as dwellers in the same county; such interests, for example, as those that pertain to marriage and divorce, the education of the young, and the tenure of Church property. The presidency of this larger Council would naturally fall to one of the county overseers, either because of his seniority in office, or because of the relative importance of the town or city which might happen to be the centre of his activities. Again, what is there intrinsically absurd or chimerical in this picture of a council representative of the religion of a whole State? Is any violence done to the principle of home-rule? Are not the value of conference and the importance of headship as fully recognized in this instance as in the other?

Take one more step. Imagine a bi-cameral assembly convened, we will say, once in nine or ten years, and representative of all the States of the Union, the smaller of the two Houses made up of representative chief pastors, one, or at most two, for each State; and the larger composed of pastors and laymen in

numbers proportionate to the populations of the States from which they come.

As in the case of the State Council, the presidency of this national body might be determined either by seniority or by such other consideration as experience should show to be the most urgent. Neither of the two Houses composing the National Council would be so large as to be cumbersome, for the number of our States is not likely ever to exceed one hundred; and with the two branches of a bi-cameral legislature standing to each other in the ratio of one hundred to three hundred, no serious difficulties of procedure would emerge.

There remains to be considered the question of worship. As there are three leading types of polity, so are there three marked varieties of divine service; to wit, the unliturgical, the elaborately liturgical, and what may be called the intermediate variety. What are we to do with these in the interest of American Catholicity? Abolish two out of the three? That would be rather an arduous undertaking. Jumble all three of them together, making a *quartum quid*, the like of which never was seen before? That would seem to be an endeavor less promising still. But what is there foolish in the suggestion that a single building, by the simple device of a greater frequency in the hours of service than is common among Protestants, might be made to meet the devotional needs alike of those who love a formal and of those who prefer, I will not say an informal, but a less

formal method of publicly worshipping Almighty God? The Roman Church recognizes and acts upon a similar principle in its classification of Masses into Low Masses and High Masses. It is incumbent upon every good Romanist that he go to Mass, and he neglects the duty at the peril of his soul; but it is not exacted of him that he attend High Mass if he prefers Low. The English Church scores a good point against the Roman by insisting, as it does, upon having the public services rendered in "a tongue understanded of the people;" but the Roman Church scores a good point against the English in providing that within the walls of one and the same consecrated building widely different types of service shall at different hours find recognition.

It is true that I am pleading for a larger application of this principle than the Roman Church allows, since there is undoubtedly a wider gulf between the non-liturgical and the liturgical celebration of the divine mysteries than between High Mass and Low Mass; but even if the people of an American town felt that they must needs "build three tabernacles," so that each type of worship might have its own separate and distinctive home, there would still be fewer competing altars in that town by some six or seven than there are to-day. There may be, there probably are, Anglicans and Roman Catholics among us sanguine enough to suppose that the rising tide of liturgical interest, so noticeable in the religious life of America just now, is destined to continue rising until

it shall have swept everything before it. "Be patient," they say. "Much has been accomplished; more is coming. Wait a little, and presently you shall hear all American Christians singing their prayers on one note." I doubt it. We Americans are not all of us musical, and the unmusical ones are likely, in "this free country," to go on saying, instead of singing, their prayers to the end of the chapter. At the epoch of the Reformation, worship had become a fine art. Let it be practised as a fine art still for the benefit of those who are edified thereby; but let us bear in mind the fact that there are artisans in the world as well as artists, and not stupidly attempt to force a high æsthetic standard upon souls not yet cultivated to the point of being able to apprehend it. The impact of Protestant thought upon the institute of worship may not, it is true, have produced all the effect that was anticipated; but it is unlikely that it will prove to have been wholly resultless. Some things have been learned that will not be unlearned, some franchises secured that will not be relinquished.

If liturgical worship really does possess that supreme excellence which many of us associate with it, we may safely trust to the workings of the law of natural selection to bring things out right in the end.

It may be objected to what I have been recommending, that to carry it out would complicate matters, and rob us of that simplicity which is one of religion's chiefest charms. But let us not suffer ourselves to be beguiled by words. Doubtless simplicity

is of the very highest value, where it may be had. We marvel at, and are often disposed to covet, the simplicity of apostolic days. The Lady Ecclesia of that era made out to live and thrive, yes, and show a very fair and comely countenance, amid surroundings of a most unelaborate sort. Just as the queen, born a peasant girl, whom some King Cophetua had loved and wedded, might look back half sorrowfully from her throne-room in the palace with its weight of embroidered hangings, its wealth of gems and gold, to the old days when she walked barefoot, pitcher in hand, along the grassy path that led from the cottage to the spring, so it is not unnatural for the modern Church, with all its inherited treasures, its great burden of memories, traditions, usages, its councils and canons, its ecclesiastical jurisprudence and ecclesiological wealth, to look back, now and then, with something like regret to those crisp morning hours when it was enough that there should be an upper room to meet in, a little bread and wine, a "hymn to Christ as God," and a few prayers. But to a great extent we must, in matters where evolution has had play, take things as we find them. Growths that have come to maturity cannot be spirited out of existence at a word. It is folly to suppose that the so-called simplicity of the seeding-time, a simplicity even at that stage of affairs more apparent than real, can be reinstated at will, or be depended upon to reproduce itself if only we can muster courage enough to cut down the existing tree. The cloud-giant of the

Arabian tale was with difficulty coaxed back into his casket; vastly more formidable would be the task of compelling an oak to retire into an acorn. In a society which undertakes to embrace within its limits all sorts and conditions of men, and to meet the spiritual needs of every one of them, we must expect the administration of worship to prove itself a somewhat complex undertaking, and must not be discouraged at finding it necessary to tolerate, within the same ecclesiastical bounds, rites and usages strikingly diverse. Why should it be for me any greater hardship to dwell in the same Church with a man who dotes upon candles and incense, than to dwell in the same town with him? It is I who have to be "tolerated" as well as he.

We have now come into possession of three watchwords of unity. In the field of Dogma, theological and ethical, the watchword is *Condensation;* in the field of Polity, the watchword is *Co-ordination;* in the field of Worship, the watchword is *Classification.*

It will be said, and with much show of reason, that I have managed to get over the ground by jumping the pitfalls. But really it has been no part of my purpose to dodge the difficulties of the subject. I own to having made as sanguine a showing as I could; but that has been because I believe in the practice of hope, as a Christian virtue, and because I refuse to believe that the clearly defined purpose of Jesus Christ is destined to suffer defeat.

That in each one of the three fields we have been

traversing there stands a *crux*, I have no desire to deny.

In the region of dogma, the *crux* is the sacramental theology.[1] Unless the philosophy of grace can be declared neutral ground, and honestly dealt with as such, there is no hope for Christian unity, either in the near future or in the far.

In the region of polity, the *crux* is the value of historicity in connection with Holy Orders. Unless those who care nothing for the continuity of the sacred ministry can persuade themselves that it is worth while to conserve that continuity for the sake of those who do care very much about it, there is no hope for Christian unity either in the near future or in the far.

In the region of worship, the *crux* is again the sacramental element. Unless those who believe and those who do not believe in such a mystical presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist as differences that service intrinsically from all other exercises of worship, can be persuaded to bear with each other's ways in practice, there is no hope for Christian unity either in the near future or in the far, and our vision of a national Church is but a will-o-the-wisp.

It all turns upon whether the Tory, mystical, romanticist disposition which loves to take its light through stained glass, and the Whig, non-mystical, common-sense disposition which thinks to save the world by founding Useful Knowledge Societies can

[1] See Appendix A.

live together peaceably in the same house. The thing would seem to be impossible; — and yet the Book of Proverbs and the Book of Psalms rub shoulders in the one Bible; and the Christ of the Synoptists and the Christ of the Fourth Gospel are one Christ.

At any rate, I beseech you to acquit me of the slightest desire to minimize these difficulties. They are not to be disposed of by an airy wave of the hand, or conjured away by the magic of a few glib sentences. They lie deep; they are triple-walled; they frown. If I have shunned discussing them in detail, it has not been from any lack of appreciation of their magnitude, but simply because of a conviction that my time might be better bestowed upon obstacles which could be shown to be removable. In the enchanted forest that surrounds the palace where the sleeping princess lies, there is much wood-cutting of a manageable sort to be done before we reach the densest thicket of all. For the present, those students of the subject do most to help forward national churchmanship who concentrate their strength on the task of finding where the line runs between the difficulties which are imaginary and the difficulties which are real. In the minds of most persons the two sorts of barriers loom equally large. To teach men to discriminate is to help them on their way. Stuffed lions and live lions at a little distance look alike, but they are not equally to be feared.

I have spoken throughout from the view-point of a

member of the Episcopal Church. There are hopeful signs, not a few, that that body is beginning to discern the pettiness of its old denominationalism, and is awaking to a sense of what true catholicity demands. It is no longer seriously contended that the momentous issues of national churchmanship are to be settled by ascertaining which discoverer first sighted land on what is now the territory of the United States, or by proving that the first baby christened within the colonies was baptized into this faith or that. It has come to be discerned that the roots of the question strike much deeper and spread much further.

Moreover, what is better still, kindliness and sympathy are coming to the fore in unexampled plenitude. We are discovering how many of our old alienations were founded upon strifes of words rather than on strifes of fact. A little of the oil of gladness goes a long way as a lubricant. What we need now is to get near each other. When the picket-guards of bivouacking armies find themselves within speaking distance, they are very apt to acknowledge one another not such bad fellows after all.

Then, again, there is that advice of St. Paul's about looking, not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others. Slowly we are learning to grow mutually appreciative. Even in the case of that widest, deepest, and apparently most hopeless of all the gulfs that yawn across Christendom, I mean that which sunders Roman Catholics

from Protestants, when we consider that northern Europe is almost wholly of the one complexion and southern Europe almost wholly of the other, there is much to be said in favor of a partition of awards. It does seem absurd, upon the face of it, does it not? to suppose that all the goodness and all the truth are with the northern nations, and all the badness and all the error with the southern ones.[1]

Moreover, it behooves all of us to be modest. The more confident a man is of the soundness of his position, the less need has he to bluster about it. The Hebrew people in the times before Christ had the strongest possible grounds for ecclesiastical self-confidence. They knew themselves to be in a true and a deep sense the people of God; theirs were the promises, theirs the tables of the Law, theirs the Scriptures of truth. All the same, when some of them took to boasting rather noisily about it, and exclaimed with vexatious iteration, as if once were not enough, "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are we," God sent his prophet to give them fair warning that if they went on talking in that supercilious way He would quickly put them on a level, in the matter of privilege, with the "out-landers" whom they despised. The true policy for every denomination that is among us is to begin at the other end, and, frankly recognizing as *bona fide* members of Christ's Holy Church Universal all who have been baptized with water into the name of

[1] See Appendix B.

the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, to see whether it cannot modestly contribute something that shall help this sacramental host to realize in outward form and shape its already latent oneness.

The Episcopal Church in this new world stands, at the present moment, at the parting of the ways. After a century of infancy, a century of childhood, and a century of adolescence, she has come at last to her majority, and reports for duty. "For duty," and towards whom? Towards all, no doubt, whom her voice can reach or her hand help, but in a special sense towards those twenty millions of believers who among our sixty or seventy millions of population have with their own mouth and consent openly acknowledged Christ. Her errand to these is the errand of the reconciler and the peacemaker.

Leadership is what is wanted. The land cries out for it,— wise, sympathetic, modest, clear-eyed, fearless leadership. Gladly, in the present temper of our American Christendom, gladly would this leadership be conceded to the historic Church of the English-speaking peoples, were she only to show a willingness to meet half-way with friendly concessions and just acknowledgments that could in no wise harm her claims, those who read the same Bible, honor the same Sacraments, and love the same Lord Jesus Christ.

Surely an American Catholic Church worthy of the name ought to have some goodlier words for those whom it is her duty to gather and include, than the

cold, hard, stolid *Non possumus* of absolutism, or the sharp apothegm, This people which knoweth not the rubrics is accursed.

If we would enlist the strong minds, the warm hearts, the strenuous souls of our day in the service of the Church of Christ, the Church of Christ must be attractively presented. Her grandeur must be appreciated, the wide reach of her comprehensiveness displayed. The trouble is that we too often identify the Church of God with all manner of trifling details that are no part of its essence, and then lift up hands of holy horror if one whom we are trying to win retorts contemptuously, "Is that the society, that the spiritual commonwealth, that the fellowship of souls, in behalf of which you would have me work myself up into a fine enthusiasm? No, I have better things to do; loftier aims absorb me, and larger hopes. Build your little city. I go my way."

But would you turn this haughty critic's slur into a humble prayer for guidance? Show him the true picture of the Church of God. Let him see the length and breadth and height and depth of it. Open his eyes to behold that innumerable company of faithful men who even now, to-day, in all climates, under all skies, are making the imitation of Christ their persistent aim. When the Kingdom is thus conceived of, when it is recognized as gathering up into itself all that has been most precious in the past, and all that makes for greater spiritual achievement in days to come, we cease to wonder at a saying

attributed to one of the worthies of the primitive days, "He that hath God for his Father hath the Church for his Mother;" for this ministration to the ideal side of our nature, of which I have been speaking, is the very sort of mothering we want. We are tempted to grow hard, we are tempted to grow bitter, we are tempted to grow cynical; for human life, as we see it, has much that is repellent to show, much that is despicable, much that is sordid. Is there, we ask, can there be any hope for such a world as this? The vision of the city that is at unity with itself is God's reply. For that it is worth one's while to live. For that some, peradventure, might even dare to die.

APPENDIX.

" Now I take my farewell of my most deare brethren of the forrain Churches with the exhortation of most holy Augustine, *If you will live of the Holy Spirit, hold Charity, love Verity, desire Unity, that you may come to Eternity.* To the God of heaven who is the God of Peace; to Jesus Christ our Lord who is the Prince of Peace; to the Holy Spirit, who is the Bond of Peace, be Glory, Honor, and Thanksgiving for ever and ever. AMEN."

Closing Sentences of Bishop Davenant's Exhortation to Brotherly Communion, 1641.

APPENDIX.

A.

CONCERNING NEUTRALIZATION OF TERRITORY IN THE REGION OF SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY.[1]

It is written of the Lord Jesus Christ that, as the end drew near, He gathered his disciples about Him in an upper room, and having broken bread with the words "This is my body," and having blessed wine with the words "This is my blood of the new covenant," He gave them to eat and to drink, adding the injunction, "This do in remembrance of Me." It is further recorded that after the resurrection, on a mountain in Galilee, at a meeting specially appointed, and so given an emphasized sanctity and significance, He said to the Eleven, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." From the Book of Acts, our first chapter of Church History, we learn that the

[1] Extract from a Reinecke Lecture read before the Faculty and Students of the Theological Seminary at Alexandria, Va.

disciples understood this commandment to involve the use of the element of water.

It thus appears that to his Gospel, which might otherwise have been understood to be a simple announcement of abstract truth with respect to "the idea of God" and "the destiny of man," Jesus Christ indissolubly linked two outward observances, each of which necessitated a use of what physicists and chemists know as matter. A spiritualist, as Lucretius would have judged Him, a materialist, as Plato would have declared Him, the Son of Man stood up in full face of both philosophies, and said, "I pronounce you wedded. Those whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder."

The opening words of the General Confession in the Communion Office of the Book of Common Prayer, wherein we address the Almighty as the "Maker of all things" and the "Judge of all men," suggest that God sustains a close and real relation to two worlds, — a world material and a world spiritual, — and that in a deep sense (though not in Spinoza's sense) both of these worlds are one in Him. It is true that in the order of the phrases a distinction of rank is recognized. We are not encouraged to infer that the two worlds are of equal value or of equal dignity. It is by an ascending climax that we pass from the Maker of "things" to the Father and the Judge of "men." But what is distinctly asserted with respect to both body and spirit, things and men, is this, — that between them

there lies no such difference as necessarily involves contrariety or schism; they admit of harmonizing if only one can get at the true formula of their harmony; they are not really enemies, they are friends. Alone among theists, the Christian has the courage cordially to welcome this belief. Partly because Nature has always been the stronghold of idolatry, and partly because so much of what goes on in Nature appears to militate against our conceptions of the holiness and the loving kindness of God, theists, as such, find themselves strongly tempted to mark a great gulf between the two realms, the spiritual and the material, and to plant danger signals on the hither side.

> "Are God and Nature then at strife,
> That Nature lends such evil dreams?"

asks the doubting heart in *In Memoriam*, evidently disposed to think that so it must be; and even such a clear-headed Christian thinker as Coleridge is said to have defined Nature as "the devil in a strait-jacket." But in its censure of the Manichæan heresy, the Church early set the stamp of its disapproval upon sentiments of this sort, and reaffirmed, in the face of objections that must have seemed even more formidable to the mind of those days than they seem to the mind of these, St. Paul's dicta that "the earth is the Lord's," and that "every creature of God is good."

These thoughts lead up to the following questions: —

(*a*) How, as a matter of fact, has the mind of Christendom stood affected towards the sacramental element in the religion of the New Testament during the centuries that have elapsed since the mandates "Do this" and "Go, baptize" were issued?

(*b*) How stand the two Sacraments of the Gospel related to the general question of the unity of the Church?

(*c*) Is there anything about the third article of the Lambeth Declaration[1] that conspicuously differentiates it from other formal utterances upon the same subject with which it is natural for us to compare it?

First, then, how has it fared with the institutes themselves? How have men thought and felt and spoken and written about sacraments during the sixty generations, more or less, covered by Church history?

"Very variously," is the only answer possible.

As was just intimated, the attitude of the individual Christian towards the sacramental element will, in every case, be largely determined by his native cast of mind. If he be one who naturally inclines to take things in the concrete, and who abhors abstractions, esteeming them to be mere unsubstantial nothings, he will incline to magnify the sacraments, and to wonder why there should be so few of them. If, on the other hand, his personal

[1] "The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him."

bias is distinctly towards idealism, disposing him to brand as unspiritual and earthy whatsoever religious product refuses to let itself be completely volatilized in the alembic of criticism, he will almost inevitably take the minimizing line, and instead of wondering why Christ should have ordained no more than two sacraments, as generically necessary to salvation, will rather marvel that He should have ordained any at all. For to a completely subjective system of theology, a sacrament is *ex vi termini* an excrescence.

As with individuals, so with their followings; for, after all, a "school of thought," so called, is but the *aura* that exhales from and orbs itself about a strong personality: sects, parties, denominations, are observed to be sacramental or non-sacramental in their general tone, according to the character of the invitation given out by the founder when the sect, party, or denomination took its rise.

Moreover, it is inevitable that in this matter the law of reaction should, from time to time, make itself felt; religion of the ultra-sacramental type becoming so plainly and hopelessly materialistic and mechanical that earnest men are impelled, out of very loyalty to Him who is a Spirit, to break with it altogether.

The Protestant Reformation, on its theological as distinguished from its political side, was a gigantic movement of this sort. A complicated sacramental system, hammered out on the anvils of the schoolmen, had been fastened as by bolts and rivets about

the body of Christ, until the Church had found itself actually imprisoned in its own armor. What wonder if, in the violence of the escape from this man-made coat of mail, the inner and more delicate fabric of the true sacramental vesture which Christ, out of pity for man's nakedness, had woven with his own hands should have suffered hurt? It could not be otherwise. A live Christianity protests against a materialized religion as instinctively as the eye protests against the cinder that has found its way beneath the lid; and when men have had dinned into them for centuries the doctrine that only by sacerdotal manipulation can they be saved, it only needs the translation of the New Testament into the vulgar tongue and a consequent acquaintance with what that document has to say about mint, anise, and cummin and the baptism of pots and pans, to precipitate a revolution.

Thus swings the pendulum, thus ebbs and flows the tide: first the image-maker; then the image-breaker; then, chisel in hand, the restorer of damaged carvings, saying cheerily, "After all, the image was not so bad; let us supply the lost features, change the expression a bit, and put it back in the old niche." Eighteenth-century Boston turned the Gospel of Christ into a metaphysic, but kept on observing the "ordinances" by force of habit, all unconscious, as it would seem, that Puritan premises necessitated Quaker conclusions. By and by came Emerson, true child of idealizing forbears, saying to his startled

communicants, What have these material emblems to do with a spiritual religion? How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Pope be right, follow him; but if George Fox, follow him. Either take these things hence or dismiss me from my charge.

This sounded logical as well as ethical, and many of New England's best flocked to the transcendental standard. But after one generation of these keen-witted folk had made trial of a Christianity stripped of its raiment and left bare, devout hearts not a few woke up to perceive and to confess that the outward side of religion had its value also; the voice of Oxford, nay, of Rome, was heard in the gates, and it began to be whispered of Bostonians, Lo, they attend Mass.

(*b*) What is the bearing of the sacramental element in religion upon the general question of the unity of the Church?

All societies are committed by the very nature of their being to some measure of symbolism. Men who find themselves, by the condition of their birth or by a definite voluntary act of their own, knit together, insist that by some outward action or object this oneness shall be made apparent. The essential fact itself is indeed invisible, but who is to be the wiser for the fact, unless at some point in the circuit the viewless unifying force flashes into light? Scores of familiar phrases testify to this truth; "a family crest," "the regimental colors," "a civic seal," — these are witnesses, respectively,

to tribal, military, and municipal unity. People seldom, if ever, dispute about these emblems, and for the simple reason that they are understood to stand for facts with respect to which there is no difference of opinion. The data of a man's origin and kinship are settled and fixed; how, then, should he dispute over the heraldic token of that which he cannot change if he would? Manifestly, his true wisdom is to make the best and the most of what is unalterable. Hence, as a rule, men take both pride and satisfaction in any symbolism that reminds them of a unity to which they stand, so to say, inevitably committed. Only "the man without a country" would dream of going in search of the most beautiful of all flags in order that under it he might live. He instinctively cheers the flag under which he was born, because, having been born under it, he has always thought of it as his own flag. It indicated national decadence and disunion that the Psalmist should have felt moved to complain, "We see not our tokens." Rob the Church of her sacramental guarantees of unity, break down with axes and hammers her font and altar, and you provoke the same cry. How can we know that we are one if we see not the tokens; and, contrariwise, if we see the tokens, are we not reminded by the very sight that, however we may differ on a thousand points, we still, in the very truest and deepest sense of all, are one body in Christ? Sacraments, in a word, are sacraments of pre-existent fact.

But there is more to be said for the unifying power of sacraments even than this. It is not enough to show the emblematic value of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These forms of action are, indeed, witnesses to the oneness of those who join in solemnizing them, but how stand they connected with that Spirit of life without whose energizing and vivifying presence unity is, and must continue, a barren name?

The masters in Sociology tell us that the two prime factors in the evolution of the human race are the instinct of reproduction and the struggle for food. Children perpetually coming to the birth, men forever toiling and moiling that they may find bread for themselves and for those whom they have begotten, — this, even this, after history has mouthed its finest phrases, and art spread its brightest colors, and poetry sung its softest notes, — this, even this, is what it all comes to, so far as the earthly side of things is concerned, that we should be born, and having been born should strive for the means of keeping alive. Surely to Sociology we may say, if this be indeed her last word to us, "Thank you for nothing."

But what a different aspect the whole thing takes on when looked at from the heavenly places! Christ comes into the world, not only that He may live the life of man, but that He may, in the fine phrase of the *Te Deum*, "lift us up for ever," so carrying the very manhood itself into God. His mission is not merely to prepare people to die, — what a melancholy blunder

it was, ever to have put such an interpretation upon his errand! — not merely to prepare people to die, but to prepare "*a* people" to live. He appears upon the planet's surface that He may become the re-organizer of the human race. "Make ready for the Kingdom," is the cry of his announcer. "Make ready for the Kingdom," is his own cry when He is come.

But the new Society, the coming Kingdom, is not to be wholly different from the old. It is to be the old glorified and ennobled. Whatever, therefore, is most central to the sociology of human life as it is will be likely to discover its counterpart and analogue in the Sociology of the Kingdom. Even so we find it. His Church is given by Christ two sacraments, and only two; because these are adequate to meet the two great demands of society as such — namely, the need that members shall be born into it, and the need that for the children thus begotten and brought forth there shall be food; otherwise the grand enterprise of making a people must fail. The sacrament of Baptism is the sacrament of birth. The subject of it is regenerate or born anew into the family of God. The sacrament of Holy Communion is the sacrament of nourishment. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." Certainly it ought to startle those who are to-day belittling the claims of Jesus Christ upon the gratitude of mankind, to note how marvellously his sacramental mandates have anticipated the ripest modern thought. It would appear that it is Science

that is catching up with Christ, rather than Christ who is lagging behind Science.

This is one interpretation of the significance of the sacraments; others are possible and valuable, for it is the glory of visible symbolism that it combines under a single outward form more shades and phases of truth than can possibly be put into any single verbal proposition. This particular rationale of the matter seems to be the one that underlies the sacramental offices of the Book of Common Prayer. It may be considered as a Greek in contrast with a Latin way of looking at the thing.

(*c*) But what of the attitude taken up by the Bishops at Lambeth with reference to this whole subject? The third of the four articles that compose the Declaration reads as follows: "The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him."

This language would seem to admit of only one construction, and that a very generous one. As against those who hold that no sacraments are essential to the unity of the Church, it is indeed exclusive; as against those who hold that sacraments other than those ordained by Christ Himself are essential to the unity of the Church, it is also exclusive; but it is hospitable to all who, having accepted the Scriptures and assented to the primitive Creeds, are content to receive and to observe Baptism and the Lord's Supper

under the form prescribed in the New Testament. The large catholicity of this way of putting the thing has scarcely had justice done it thus far in the discussion. Neither in England nor in America does there seem to have been any adequate appreciation of what it meant for Anglican theologians to concede so much as is here conceded. That this article should have been allowed to pass, as it has passed, almost without challenge and as if it were the merest commonplace, is, of all the surprises of which this long debate has been prolific, the most surprising. When we consider how the whole Anglican Communion has been, for three hundred years, racked and torn by disputes as to the true philosophy of the sacraments; when we recall the scores, yes, the hundreds of volumes that have been written during the last half-century, to go no further back, for the purpose of unfolding and establishing the true theory of baptismal regeneration and eucharistic grace, — how astonishing it is that a proposition to throw theories to the wind and to rest content with simply observing the mandates, leaving the blessing to come in such fashion as it shall please God to send it, — how amazing that, with all the facts of the past in full view, such a proposition as this should have provoked no ripple of dissent, stirred no syllable of protest! One might suppose that the Church of England and its sister Church in this country would have been up in arms. And yet well-intentioned people by the thousand, who do not mean to misrepresent any person or any thing, go on saying that the Lambeth Declaration

exhibits no real concession on the part of those who framed it, and that it is nothing in the world but a plausible device for persuading non-Episcopal Christians to become Episcopalians in ignorance of what they are about. No concession on the part of Anglicans in declaring that henceforth there shall be on their part no insistence upon any theory of the sacraments provided the sacraments themselves are honored and their use maintained? No concession? Why, the history of English religion, since Elizabeth's reign, shows nothing to compare with it. Think of the long succession of wrangles over this subject, beginning from the day when men were burned to death for having erroneously conceived the doctrine of the real presence, and coming down to the latest instance of imprisonment for ritual malpractice; recall the Gorham controversy, the Hampden controversy; remember the silencing of Pusey, the hegira of Newman; refresh your recollection of the Tractarian literature; read again the *Apologia* and the *Eirenicon;* look back at the genesis of the Reformed Episcopal Church, and then declare, is it nothing that the leaders of the Communion which has witnessed all this fratricidal strife should come forward — voluntarily come forward — and declare that a man's philosophy of the sacraments shall no longer be made the test of his fitness to receive the sacraments?

And yet we are continually hearing it said, on this side and that, as the discussion proceeds, "Oh, as to the first three articles of the Declaration, we need not

waste time over them, — about them we are practically agreed already; the only point worth arguing is 'the historic Episcopate.'"

Now, while it is true that the question of the historic Episcopate, for the reason that it touches particular individuals and imports a personal element into the debate, is, in a way, more interesting than the questions of the Bible, the Creed, and the Sacraments, it is not true that it is intrinsically more important than they. If those who have been criticising the Bishops for what they "demand" in the fourth article would give a little time to considering what these same Bishops concede in the third, we should come, all of us, into calmer mood, besides attaining, or, let me say, because of our having attained, a truer perspective.

But whether the Bishops of the Anglican Communion accomplish anything for unity or not, they are to be congratulated as theologians upon having taken in this matter of the sacraments a position which is intrinsically unassailable.

Why should we expect to know more about the body spiritual than we can possibly pretend to know about the body natural? Ecclesiology ought to be esteemed at least as difficult a study as Physiology. If Baptism be the sacrament of birth and Holy Communion the sacrament of nourishment, we surely ought not to complain if these phenomena of the spiritual order show themselves as little amenable to analytical treatment as do the corresponding phenomena in

the natural order. No man, in the present state of our knowledge, so much as dreams of explaining the inner secrets of embryology and nutrition; why then should we expect to understand, or why should we wish to force others into saying that they understand, how souls are born or how spirits are fed? It is not first the spiritual and then the natural; it is "first the natural and then the spiritual." We reverse the true order of the mind's progress when we grapple with the hardest problems first. If the day ever comes for us to understand all mysteries and all knowledge, we shall doubtless, along with other things, possess a complete philosophy of sacraments; but perhaps by that time we shall have got beyond the need of sacraments. Lambeth, Geneva, Rome will all have been forgotten.

B.

THE PLACE OF TEMPERAMENT IN RELIGION.[1]

The variety which characterizes men's attitudes in religion is probably in the main due to diverse methods of training. We think thus or so about creeds, sacraments, prayers, maxims of conduct, and the like, because we are brought up to think thus or so about them. But allowance must also be made for that mysterious background of every man's life which we know as his natural temperament. The ancient physicians went very deeply into this matter, or thought that they did, for they not only classified men according to their temperaments, but they insisted that the temperaments themselves were occasioned by certain humours fluent throughout the body, and by their presence there determining that one man should be "sanguine," another "choleric," or another "melancholy," as the case might be. This theory has been long dead, though the nomenclature of it survives in the usages of common speech; and yet the doctrine of the four humours

[1] Extract from a Sermon preached before the Faculty and Students of the Divinity School at Philadelphia.

or temperaments may be said to have something that answers to it in the permanent constitution of human nature. As a matter of fact, there are four predominant ways of looking at things, four moods or tempers that always have prevailed and doubtless always will prevail to color the intercourse of man with man. There are born conservatives and born liberals; nay, more than this, there are born liberal-conservatives and born conservative-liberals.

These are the four temperaments. Get together any considerable number of people, and set them to discussing any question that touches upon human conduct, whether in the political or the social or the religious sphere, and every one of these several ways of looking at things will be found to be present and self-assertive. Under the names of "Right" and "Left," "Right-centre" and "Left-centre," these distinctive phases of thought and feeling figure continually in the political life of contemporary Europe. But although the names are modern, the things for which they stand are not. The fourfold classification is something more than a convenience; it points to differences rooted in the nature of things. To a mind of the conservative cast, only such measures approve themselves as have been tried and tested. What is venerable is, because venerable, authentic; newness is its own condemnation. "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." In tones so elo-

quent as these, and so persuasive, can Conservatism speak.

But Liberalism is not less ready. "Faith" is its watchword. Those, it reminds us, have been the heroes and leaders of mankind who have had eyes given them to discern the undiscovered continents of truth; who have cut loose from precedent and prescription, and have struck out courageously, forgetful of the past, and deaf to all old-time traditions, in the confident belief that safety lay in motion, and that immobility meant death. Moreover, Liberalism can quote Scripture too. Are we not, it confidently asks, the children of a God who declares that He makes "all things new," and is not our best hand-book of religion a *New* Testament?

But over and above the minds distinctly conservative and the minds distinctly liberal there are other minds so constituted that it is impossible for them not to recognize truth on both sides. They feel the charm, they admit the power, they know the value, of such things as ripeness and maturity; but, at the same time, they recognize all about them evidence incontrovertible that man can and does better himself in a thousand ways by waiting upon the untried and thrusting out valiantly into the deep. Of this intermediate multitude one half, let us say, grafts its faith in the new upon its confidence in the old, while the other half grafts its respect for the old upon its enthusiasm for the new. To the liberal conservative the old is his stand-by, the new is his half-grudging concession. To

the conservative-liberal the new is his heart's desire, while the old is something which he has learned that it is dangerous to leave out of the account. These are the four temperaments of man, and of these is the whole earth overspread. What I have been describing is no accident of the passing century, no special characteristic of one race or people rather than another; it is a law of variation inbred in humanity as such. We are born so.

The religious and ecclesiastical results of temperament make an interesting study. The three great territorial divisions of the Church are her doctrine, her governance, and her worship. She is here on earth to teach, to shepherd, and to pray. The soul of man needs to be instructed, it needs to be sympathized with, it needs to be uplifted. Upon the Church's shoulders rests the duty of meeting this threefold need: she must make disciples, she must gather these disciples into a flock, she must lead the flock in the green pastures of devotion. As visible symbols, concrete emblems of this triple ministry, we have the pulpit, the pastoral staff, the altar; these concrete tokens help us to understand and appreciate the abstract terms, doctrine, discipline, and worship.

But the point to be especially emphasized is this — that when the four temperaments of man are brought into contact and connection with the three forms of the Church's activity, there ensue combinations so various and so intricate that the futility as well as the injustice of our current partisan vocabulary is made

manifest at once. Take doctrine, for instance, and consider how delicately shaded off, one into another, are the differences that divide men in the Church.

The conservative is all for the "faith once delivered," "the sacred deposit," "the Catholic Creed." He insists, and insists rightly, that Christianity is what it is in virtue of certain disclosures made to man at definite epochs in history. He maintains, and maintains justly, that unless Christ's religion brings us a clearly articulated message with respect to subjects about which we should otherwise have remained ignorant to the end of time, we are no better off than the heathen, who may, if they choose, guess at truth as well as we.

On the other hand, the liberal makes much of a certain prophetic succession which is, to his mind, quite as important as any apostolic succession possibly can be to other minds. Why should we believe, he asks, that progress in the attainment of spiritual knowledge stopped short at the close of the first century, or, if not so soon as that, then on the day of the adjournment of the last of "the undisputed general councils"? Did not Christ promise his disciples the assistance of an ever-present spiritual Revealer who should guide them, little by little, into all the truth? So, then, the fresher any man's theology, and the more nearly up to date, the better. But "Stop! Stop!" cries the conservative-liberal; "this will never do. I grant you that ships are given sails in order that they may stand out to sea, trusting

themselves to the winds of God; but they are also equipped with anchors; and while I am willing and glad to start off with you on your voyage of discovery, I refuse to step on board until you show me some evidence of your having made provision against gales." While — last and wisest of them all — the liberal-conservative insists that neither is "fixity of interpretation" nor yet laxity of interpretation really "of the essence of the Creed," but that what is of its essence is a certain marvellous adaptability, whereby it comes to pass that the articles of the faith are never negatived, but only given a fuller, deeper, and more satisfying signification, the faster the great Father of Lights lets more light be poured down into this dim world of his. Copernicus did not annul the first paragraph of the Creed by what he proved, Newton laid no violent hand upon the second, Lavoisier caused no hiatus in the third; but the words "Maker of heaven and earth," the words "He ascended into heaven," and the words "the Resurrection of the body," have meant more to intelligent believers since these three men made their discoveries than they meant before. That is what the liberal-conservative has to say about it, — the man who believes in the past, but not so stupidly as to keep his eyes fast shut to anything that God may be revealing in the present.

It is easy to see that in the field of governance the conservative will naturally favor whatever makes for continuity of control, for regularity in the transmission of authority, and in general for what we know

as legitimacy; that the liberal, on the other hand, will smile approvingly on new methods of administration, and, so that men make full proof of their ministry by showing themselves successful in the conversion of souls to God, will deprecate too close a scrutiny of ecclesiastical pedigrees; that the conservative-liberal will say: "Oh yes, I like this spiritual freedom; but would n't it be prudent to draw the line somewhere?" and that the liberal-conservative will respond: "Yes, certainly, the line must be drawn; but let us make it just as inclusive as ever we conscientiously can. The one sin which God Almighty will never forgive to any portion of his Church is the sin of want of sympathy."

And then, again, there is worship. We can have little doubt as to how the men of the different temperaments will stand affected towards that. With the conservative it will be the rubric, the whole rubric, and nothing but the rubric; with the liberal it will be what he laxly calls "the rubric of common-sense." The conservative-liberal will declare that he loves a simple, unaffected, and, as it were, spontaneous rendering of divine service, while yet he does not see why it should not be enriched a little and made dignified by the old traditional methods; while the liberal-conservative will argue that, supposing those who are attached to the old ways in all their oldness are not only allowed to have them, but are given guarantees that they shall never be molested in their enjoyment of them, he cannot, for the life of him, understand why Anglicans should refuse Church fellowship to

congregations of Christian folk who are ready for their polity, but not quite ready for all the details of their liturgy.

It might at first sight appear, from what has been said, as if Churchmen might all be classified — if classified they must be — under four heads; but no, the thing is far from being so simple as all this, seeing that various cross-combinations are possible, conservatism itself seeming to one conservative to demand that he differ from his brother conservative in matters of worship while agreeing with him in questions of polity, and that he agree with another on points of polity while differing with him widely in his view of dogma.

Instead, therefore, of only four varieties of Churchmanship, there may conceivably be it is difficult to say how many. And what is the just inference from such a conclusion? Is it not this, — that since all these manifold types of character do, as a matter of fact, already co-exist amicably enough within the limits of a single historic Church, there is no reason, in the nature of things, why that Church should not become far more truly an American Church than it can truthfully boast of being now?

Already Anglican religion is in theory hospitable and inclusive; it remains for us of this new world, acting under the guidance and blessing of Him who, doubtless for cause, led our fathers hither, to see whether we cannot translate theory into fact.

C.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF IRENIC LITERATURE, AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.[1]

Adams, C. Essay on Christian Union. New York, 1850.

Alford, H. Union of Christendom Considered in its Home Aspect. (Essays and Addresses.) London, Strahan & Co., 1869.

Anon. Christian Union. (Theological Essays from the Princeton Review, Series 2.)

—— Claims of the Church of Rome considered with a View to Unity. London, 1850.

—— An Essay toward a Proposal for Catholic Union. Dublin (reprint), 1781.

—— Essays concerning the Church and the Unification of Christendom. New York, 1895.

—— Liber Redivivus: or, the Booke of the Universal Kirke Reopened. Glasgow, 1839.

—— Principles of Protestantism with a View to Unity. London, 1849.

—— Schism as Opposed to Unity. London, 1839.

—— Science and the Gospel; or, The Church and the Nations. London, 1870.

—— Scriptural Unity of Protestant Churches. Dublin, Robertson, 1835.

[1] This Bibliography has been mainly compiled by the Rev. Melville K. Bailey, of Grace Chapel Settlement, New York.

Anon. A Sure Hope of Reconciliation. London, Darling, 1849.

Aydelott, B. P. Incidental Benefits of Denominational Division: An Argument for Christian Union. Cincinnati, Jones, 1846.

Bacon, Leonard W., D.D., History of American Christianity. Ch. Lit. Co., 1897.

—— Irenics and Polemics, with Sundry Essays in Church History. New York, Christian Literature Co., 1895.

Bannerman, Rev. H. Essays on Christian Unity. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1871.

Barbour, Prof. J. H. Christian Union: Ideal, Actual, Possible: A Sermon. Middletown, Conn., 1892.

Barrow, Isaac. Discourse on the Unity of the Church (In his Theological Works, vol. viii.) Cambridge, 1859.

Baxter, R. Catholic Unity. (Practical Works, vol. xvi.) London, Duncan (reprint), 1830.

—— The Cure of Church Divisions. London, 1670.

—— A Defence of the Principles of Love. London, 1671.

—— True and Only Way of Concord of all Christian Churches. London, 1680.

Bennett, Rev. W. J. E. The Church's Broken Unity. Five vols. London, Hayes, n. d.

Benscough, Robert. A Discourse on the Unity of the Church. Exeter, 1704.

Blenkinsopp, E. L. Reunion of the Church. (Church and the World, p. 178.) London, Longmans, 1866.

Bossuet, Leibnitz, and Molanus. Their Correspondence. See Biography of Bossuet by H. Sidney Lear, pp. 537 ff. London, Rivingtons, 1877.

Bradford, Amory H., D.D. Christ and the Church. New York, Revells, n. d.

Briggs, C. A., D.D. Whither? (Christian Unity, pp. 226 ff.) New York, Scribners, 1889.

Butler, C. M. Protestant Episcopal Doctrine and Church Unity. New York, 1887.

Butler, Rev. Wm. Archer. Primitive Church Principles not Inconsistent with Universal Christian Sympathy. Sermon XXIV., First Series. London, Macmillan & Co., 1866.

Carroll, H. K., LL.D. The Religious Forces of the United States. New York, 1893.

Chalmers, Thos., D.D., et al. Essays on Christian Union. London, Hamilton, 1845.

Chamberlain, L. T., D.D. Christian Unity and the Evangelization of Philadelphia: An Address, Nov. 29, 1891. Philadelphia, n. d.

Church Club Lectures, 1895. Christian Unity and the Bishops' Declaration. New York, E. & J. B. Young, 1895.

Church, P. Religious Dissensions: Their Cause and Cure. New York, Gould & Newman, 1838.

Church Unity. Five Lectures delivered in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1896. New York, Scribners, 1896.

Clark, Rev. Dorus, D.D. The Oneness of the Christian Church. Boston, 1870.

Cosin, Archbishop. Works, vol. iv. p. 466 ff.; vol. v. p. 527 ff. Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, Oxford, 1843.

Coxe, A. C., D.D., Bp. The Criterion: a Means of Distinguishing Truth from Error in Questions of the Times; with four letters on the Eirenicon of Dr. Pusey. New York, 1866.

Crapsey, Algernon Sydney. A Voice in the Wilderness. New York, James Pott & Co., 1897.

Croft, Herbert. The Naked Truth; or, The True State of the Primitive Church. London, 1675.

Crothers, Samuel McChord. "Members of One Body." Six Sermons preached at Unity Church, St. Paul, Minn. Boston, 1892.

Dale, R. W. Christ and the Controversies of Christendom. New York, Whittaker, n. d.

Davenant, John, D.D., Bishop of Sarum. An Exhortation to Brotherly Love betwixt the Protestant Churches. 1641.

Davenport, J. S. Christian Unity and its Recovery. New York, Appleton, 1866.

Dawson, W. J. The Church of To-morrow. (Addresses.) New York, 1892.

Dix, Rev. Morgan, S.T.D. Thoughts on the Lost Unity of the Christian World, and Steps to Recovery. New York, 1864.

Döllinger, J. H., D.D. Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches. Translated by Rev. H. N. Oxenham. London, Rivingtons, 1872.

Earbury, Matthias. Principles of Church Unity Considered, in which it is proved that Catholic Bishops are the Centre of Unity. London, 1716.

Earle, Rev. W., M. A. The Reunion of Christendom in Apostolic Succession for the Evangelization of the World. London, Elliot Stock, 1895.

Edwards, Jonathan, D.D. Attempt to Promote Explicit Agreement and Visible Union of God's People. Elizabethtown, 1794.

Evangelical Alliance.

Proceedings, London, 1846. London, 1847.
Proceedings, Geneva, 1861. Edinburgh, 1862.
Proceedings, Amsterdam, 1867. London, 1868.
Proceedings, New York, 1873. New York, 1874.
Proceedings, Copenhagen, 1884. London, 1885.
History, Essays, Orations, 1873. New York, 1874.
Religious Condition of Christendom. London, 1852.

Religious Condition of Christendom. London, 1859.
Religious Condition of Christendom. London, 1880.
Christendom from the Standpoint of Italy. London, 1891.

Federation of Churches of New York. Annual Reports, 1895, 1896, 1897.

Forrester, H. Christian Unity and the Historic Episcopate. New York, 1889.

Ffoulkes, Rev. E. S., B.D. Christendom's Divisions; being a Philosophical Sketch of the Divisions of the Christian Family in East and West. London, 1865–7.

Fulton, John, D.D., LL.D. The Chalcedonian Decree, or Historical Christianity confirmed by Modern Science and untouched by Modern Criticism. New York, Whittaker, 1892.

Gallagher, Rev. Mason. The Primitive Eirenicon. New York, 1868.

Gladden, Washington, D.D. The Christian League of Connecticut. New York, Century Co., 1883.

Gleig, R. G. The Great Problem — Can it be Solved? Edinburgh, Blackwood, 1876.

Gorton, B. Primitive Christianity Revived: Visible Ordinances, Sects, and Denominations Done away. Troy, Moffitt & Lyon, 1804.

Grindelwald Conference. Reports, *passim.*

Hall, P. The Harmony of Protestant Confessions. London, Shaw, 1842.

Hall, Robert. On Terms of Communion. (In his Works.) London, 1831.

Hamlin, T. S., D.D. Denominationalism versus Christian Union. New York, Revells, 1891.

Hammond, Joseph, LL.B. Church or Chapel: An Eirenicon. London, Gardner, Darton, & Co., 1890.

Hare, J. C. The Means of Unity: A Charge to the Clergy. London, Parker, 1847.

Harper, T. Unity of the Church. (In his "Peace through the Truth.") London, Burns & Oates, n. d.

Harris, J. Union; or, The Divided Church made Whole. London, 1850.

Hook, W. F. A Call to Union on the Principles of the English Reformation. New York, Rufus Dawes, 1843.

Hort, F. J. A., D.D. The Christian Ecclesia. London, Macmillan, 1897.

Huntington, W. R., D.D. The Church Idea: An Essay towards Unity. New York, Dutton, 1870.

—— Peace of the Church. (Bohlen Lectures, 1891.) New York, Scribners, 1891.

Knox, Alexander. Letter: On the Impossibility of Union between the Churches of England and Rome. (In his Works, vol. iii.) London, Duncan, 1837.

Lambeth Conference. Proceedings, 1878, 1888, 1897.

Lee, F. G. (Editor). Essays on the Reunion of Christendom, by Members of the Roman Catholic, Oriental, and Anglican Communions. With an Introductory Essay by E. B. Pusey. London, Masters, 1867.

Lewis, W. H., D.D. Christian Union and the Protestant Episcopal Church in its Relation to Church Unity. New York, Harriman, 1858.

Lindsay, Alexander, Lord. Œcumenicity in relation to the Church of England. London, John Murray, 1870.

McCrie, Thomas. The Unity of the Church, her Divisions, and their Removal. Edinburgh, Blackwood, 1821.

McElhinney, J. J. The Doctrine of the Church: A Historical Monograph. Philadelphia, Claxton, Remsen, & Haeffelfinger, 1871.

McIlvaine, C. P. The Holy Catholic Church; or, The Communion of Saints in the Mystical Body of Christ. Philadelphia, 1844.

McNeile, H. The Church and the Churches. London, 1847.

Manning, Henry Edward, Cardinal. England and Christendom. London, 1867.

—— Reunion of Christendom. London, Longmans. 1866.

—— Unity of the Church. London, 1842.

Mason, Arthur James, D.D. The Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity. London, Longmans, 1896.

Mason, John M. A Plea for Sacramental Communion on Catholic Principles. New York, 1816.

Massie, J. W. The Evangelical Alliance: Its Origin and Development. London, 1847.

Maurice, F. D. The Kingdom of Christ. London, 1838 & 1842.

—— On the Unity of the Church. (Theol. Essays, pp. 375–403.) London, Macmillan, 1853.

Moehler, John Adam, D.D. Symbolism. London, 1843. (Translated from the German.)

Newman, F. W. Catholic Union. London, Chapman & Hall, n. d.

Newman, J. H., Cardinal. Is Healthful Reunion Impossible? London, Parker & Co., 1870.

O'Neil, Rev. Simeon Wilberforce, M.A. Christian Unity. London, Hayes, 1879.

Overbeck, J. J. Catholic Orthodoxy and Anglo-Catholicism. London, Trübner, 1860.

Pamphleteer, The. Irenicum, or the Peacemaker. Richmond, 1819–20.

Parkhurst, Charles H., D.D. First Steps toward Christian Unity. Two Studies: I. The Body of Christ. II. Members One of Another. New York, n. d.

Plumptre, E. H., D.D. Christ and the Kingdom. (Boyle Lectures, 1866.) London, Strahan, 1867.

Potter, Henry C., D.D., Bp. In Church Club Lectures, 1895.

Preston, T. S. Christian Unity. (Lectures.) New York, Sadliers, 1867.

Prime, S. I., D.D. The Ten Days' Conference of the Evangelical Alliance at Amsterdam, 1867.

Pusey, E. B., D.D. An Eirenicon. London, Rivingtons, 1865.

—— Essays on Reunion. The Introductory Essay. (In his Minor Works.) London, 1867.

Ranney, D. H. The Evangelical Church. True Grounds for Union of the Saints. Woodstock, Vt., 1840.

Reid, Rev. Gilbert, The Reunion of Christendom as it appears to a Foreign Missionary. New York, Revells, 1897.

Reusch, Fr. Heim, Doctor. Report of the Union Conferences held at Bonn, August 10–16, 1865, under the Presidency of Dr. Von Döllinger. Tr. by Samuel Buell. New York, Whittaker, 1875.

à Sancta Clara, Franciscus (Christopher Davenport). Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles. Lyons, 1634.

de Sayres, Rev. J. Christian Reunion. (Hulsean Lecture, 1886.) St. John's, N. B., 1888.

Saywell, William. Means of Union. London, 1681.

—— Evangelical Unity. London, 1682.

Schaff, Philip, D.D., LL.D. Creeds of Christendom. New York, Harpers, 1877.

—— Harmony of the Reformed Confessions. (Separately printed.) New York, 1877.

—— Report of his Mission to Europe in behalf of the Alliance. New York, 1870.

—— The Reunion of Christendom. New York, 1893.

Schmucker, S. S. The True Unity of Christ's Church, with a Plan for Christian Union. New York, Randolph, 1870.

Seward, Thomas F. A Brotherhood of Christian Unity. South Orange, N. J., 1891.

Seymour, George F., S.T.D., Bp. The Historic Episcopate: a Contribution towards Church Unity. New York, Church Unity Quarterly, I. 1, October, 1892.

Sheraton, J. P., Prin. The Lambeth Conference and Christian Unity, 1888. Toronto, n. d.

Sherlock, William. A Discourse about Church Unity. London, 1681.

Shields, Charles W., D.D. The Historic Episcopate: An Essay on the Four Articles of Church Unity. New York, 1894.

—— The United Church of the United States. New York, Scribners, 1895.

Smith, H. B. The State of Religion in the U. S. A. Report to the Evangelical Alliance. New York, 1868.

Spry, J. H. Christian Union Doctrinally and Historically Considered. (Bampton Lectures, 1816.) Oxford, Parker, 1817.

de Starck, Baron. The Reunion of the Different Christian Communions. Baltimore, Kelley & Piet, 1868.

Stevens, Wm. Bacon, D.D., LL.D., Bp. The Lambeth Conference of 1878. Philadelphia, 1879.

Stillingfleet, Edward. Irenicum: A Weapon Salve for the Church's Wounds. London, 1659.

Stone, J. S. The Church Universal. New York, 1846.

Taylor, Jeremy, D.D. Liberty of Prophesying. London, 1647.

Tennison, Thomas. An Argument of Union. (Dissent.) London, 1718.

Thompson, Edward H. Remarks on Certain Anglican Theories of Unity. London, 1847.

—— The Unity of the Episcopate. London, 1847.

Usher, James, Abp. The Reduction of Episcopacy into the Form of Synodical Government Received in the Ancient Church. London, 1656.

Vail, T. D. The Comprehensive Church, or Christian Unity and Ecclesiastical Union. Hartford, Huntington, 1841.

Van Dyck, A. An Argument for the Abolition of Sects. New York, 1835.

Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Dupin. Their Correspondence. Appendix of Moccaine's Edition of Mosheim's Church History.

Ward, W. G. The Ideal of a Christian Church considered in Comparison with Existing Practice. London, Toovey, 1844.

Whately, Richard, D.D. The Kingdom of Christ Delineated. New York, Wiley & Putnam, 1848.

Wilson, Rev. H. B. The Communion of Saints: An Attempt to Illustrate the True Principles of Christian Union. (Bampton Lecture, 1851.) Oxford, 1851.

—— Schemes of Christian Comprehension. London, Parker & Co., 1857.

Wordsworth, Rev. Christopher. Public Appeals on Behalf of Christian Unity. Edinburgh, Macmillan, 1887.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: Sept. 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 010 134 205 0